

both of Ohio, for creation of a park for care of the American elk—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey: Petition of Post Card Manufacturers and Allied Trades' Protective Association of United States, favoring tariff on post cards—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOWDEN: Petitions of citizens of Lee, Galena, Shannon, Pawpaw, Pearl City, Elizabeth, Hanover, Apple River, Leaf River, Mount Morris, Forreston, Stockton, Byron, Dakota, and Warren, all in the State of Illinois, opposing parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota: Petition of Bee Hive Company, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., opposing any increase of duty on gloves—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCALL: Petition of natives of Philippine Islands, favoring striking out all reference to Philippines in pending tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Memorial of legislature of Massachusetts, against an inheritance-tax system—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of legislature of Massachusetts, relative to rolls of Revolutionary regiments and companies and to statements regarding Revolutionary prisoners—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, petition of Taylor Brothers and the Boston Retail Grocers' Association, of Boston, for reduction of tariff on wheat to 10 cents—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of A. Rosa Bevans, praying for reference of war claim to the Court of Claims under the Bowman Act—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens and merchants of Amarillo, Tex., against a parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Caldwell, Tex., against the 25 per cent duty proposed on oils, spices, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petitions of D. W. Stoner, of Union City, Ind.; Hoffman Leaf Tobacco Company, of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Wisconsin; and Corwin & Baker, and C. H. Cain, of Greenville, Ohio, against Philippine tobacco coming in duty free—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of 12 citizens of the Fourth Congressional District of Ohio, against duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of president of the Ohio Baking Company, favoring prohibition by law of all gambling in food supplies, a reduction of the tariff on foodstuffs, and free Canadian grain—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 11, 1909.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington. The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES presented petitions of sundry citizens of Pateros, Spokane, Ritzville, and Eltopia, all in the State of Washington, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Homestead and Brookville, in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CULLOM presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Pontiac, Bloomington, Decatur, Stonington, Carbondale, Johnson City, Benton, Aurora, and Mount Vernon, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CURTIS presented a petition of 170 citizens of the State of Kansas, praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented memorials of the mayor and common council of De Pere, of the mayor and common council of Stevens Point, and of the mayor and common council of Neenah, all in the State of Wisconsin, remonstrating against a reduction of the present duty on print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Publes, Malone, and Oshkosh, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Putney Brothers Company, of Waukesha, Wis., remonstrating against an increase of the duty on imported gloves, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Wisconsin Natural History Society, praying for the repeal of the duty on lumber, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PILES presented a petition of Washington Grange, No. 82, Patrons of Husbandry, of Vancouver, Wash., praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings banks" bills, which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FRYE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Sangerville, Me., and a petition of sundry citizens of Camden, Me., praying for the protection of the carded-wool industry, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Presque Isle, Me., praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. RAYNER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Gaithersburg, and Rockville, all in the State of Maryland, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented a joint resolution of the legislature of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution memorializing Congress in regard to international peace.

Whereas the progress of industry and the happiness and prosperity of the people of all countries depends upon the maintenance of peace among the nations of the world; and

Whereas international wars have resulted usually from jealousies due in a large degree to mutual misunderstandings which could have been made clear by conferences and investigations; and

Whereas it would promote the progress of peace in international relations to have a parliamentary union at stated intervals, composed of delegates from all nations; and

Whereas the friendly relations existing between the United States and all nations make it peculiarly fitting that the proposal should come from this country: Therefore be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That we respectfully memorialize the Congress of the United States to initiate proceedings to invite the nations of the world to send delegates to an interparliamentary union for the purpose of discussing and establishing a system of international arbitration and investigation of disputes between nations and to arrange for a permanent interparliamentary union at stated intervals; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the foregoing be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives from this State.

L. H. BANCROFT,
Speaker of the Assembly.

JOHN STRANGE,
President of the Senate.

C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

F. E. ANDREWS,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. STEPHENSON presented petitions of the mayor and common council of De Pere, of the mayor and common council of Neenah, of the mayor and common council of Stevens Point, and of the mayor and common council of Eau Claire, all in the State of Wisconsin, praying for a reduction of the present duty on print paper and wood pulp, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial of the Cambridge Local, of the American Society of Equity of Rockdale, Wis., remonstrating against the repeal of the duty on imported tobacco, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of Charles McCumber, of Burlington, Wis., and a petition of the Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for the repeal of the duty on hides, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Wisconsin Natural History Society, praying for the repeal of the duty on lumber, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. GUGGENHEIM:

A bill (S. 2306) granting a pension to Etta B. Stewart;

A bill (S. 2307) granting an increase of pension to David S. Green;

A bill (S. 2308) granting an increase of pension to Sara B. C. Stephenson (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2309) granting an increase of pension to Charles Critchell (with the accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 2310) granting an increase of pension to George H. Burnett (with the accompanying papers); and
 A bill (S. 2311) granting an increase of pension to Matthew B. Noel (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 2312) granting an increase of pension to James Strong;

A bill (S. 2313) granting an increase of pension to Harvey W. Cory;

A bill (S. 2314) granting an increase of pension to William K. Griffiths; and

A bill (S. 2315) granting an increase of pension to James Olds; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CULLOM:

A bill (S. 2316) granting a pension to Laura Troxel (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PILES:

A bill (S. 2317) granting an increase of pension to Mary Carpenter (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 2318) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James H. Nowlin, alias James M. Hendley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2319) for the relief of Bernard W. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BEVERIDGE:

A bill (S. 2320) granting an increase of pension to William Dollman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DEPEW:

A bill (S. 2321) to amend an act entitled "An act temporarily to provide revenues and a civil government for Porto Rico, and for other purposes," approved April 12, 1900; to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 2322) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Engberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. SMOOT submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. DICK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The first bill on the calendar will now be taken up.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1438) to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 51 refers to white lead and white pigment containing lead. Paragraph 53 refers to white pigment containing zinc. The committee have under consideration a different scale of duties in reference to zinc ore and the products of zinc. I therefore ask that paragraphs 51 and 53 may go over without action, and I ask that paragraph 54 be passed over. Then paragraph 56 involves the same question, white acetate of lead, which is made from white lead, and I ask that it may go over also.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. BRISTOW. I understand that paragraph 51 then goes over for the present?

Mr. ALDRICH. It does.

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to say that when it is taken up I shall want to be heard on that paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator will undoubtedly have an opportunity.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that paragraphs 51 and 53 are covered by the request.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 52 may go over also.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator includes paragraph 52 in his request?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, that will be included, and the paragraphs will be passed over. The next paragraph passed over will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 58—

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that that may go over also.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Rhode Island? The Chair hears none, and the paragraph will be passed over. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 59.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the committee amendment to that paragraph may be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee amendment to this paragraph was agreed to, and the paragraph was passed over after the committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the paragraph as amended be agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph will be agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the next one passed over?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 61 was passed over. The committee propose to strike out paragraph 61 in the following words:

61. Nitrate of, or saltpeter, refined, one-half of 1 cent per pound.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not know why that amendment was objected to before. There is a very small attendance here. It seems that it was objected to. There may be some one on our side who wishes to be present when it is considered.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; it was the Senator from New Jersey who asked that it might go over. He wanted to save a part of it from the free list. What is the next one?

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 66, on page 16. After the word "santonin," in line 20, on page 16, the Committee on Finance report to strike out the words "fifty cents" and insert the words "one dollar," so as to make the paragraph read:

66. Santonin, and all salts thereof containing 80 per cent or over of santonin, \$1 per pound.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to agreeing to the committee amendment?

Mr. BRISTOW. I should like to have a vote on it.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Carolina suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|--------------|------------|------------------|--------------|
| Aldrich | Clay | Hughes | Perkins |
| Bacon | Crane | Johnson, N. Dak. | Piles |
| Beveridge | Crawford | Johnston, Ala. | Richardson |
| Borah | Cullom | Jones | Root |
| Bradley | Cummins | Kean | Scott |
| Brandeggee | Curtis | La Follette | Smith, Md. |
| Bristow | Depew | Lodge | Smith, Mich. |
| Brown | Dillingham | McEnery | Smoot |
| Bulkeley | Flint | McLaurin | Stephenson |
| Burkett | Foster | Martin | Stone |
| Burnham | Frye | Nelson | Sutherland |
| Burrows | Gallinger | Oliver | Taliaferro |
| Carter | Gamble | Overman | Warner |
| Clapp | Guggenheim | Page | Warren |
| Clark, Wyo. | Hale | Paynter | |
| Clarke, Ark. | Heyburn | Penrose | |

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee to paragraph 66, striking out "50 cents" and inserting "\$1."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It increases the House rate 100 per cent. I merely want to know why?

Mr. ALDRICH. The duty on santonin by the act of 1883 was \$3 a pound, and by the act of 1890, \$2.50 a pound. It was reduced in 1894 by the Wilson-Gorman Act to \$1 a pound, and it has remained there ever since. The importations of 1907 were valued at \$65,000. The unit of value was \$7.90 a pound, or about \$8 a pound, and the ad valorem rate was \$12.06. Under the present law there is a duty of only 12 per cent.

Mr. OVERMAN. What was the rate under the Dingley law?

Mr. ALDRICH. Under the Dingley law it was \$1, under the Gorman law it was \$1, and the present rate is \$1, and that is only 12 per cent on the product.

Mr. OVERMAN. The House made it 50 cents.

Mr. ALDRICH. The House made it 50 cents, unadvisedly, I think.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to go back to paragraph 63, where the committee will propose certain amendments.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate will return to paragraph 63.

Mr. ALDRICH. On page 15, line 12, after the word "calomel," I move to insert the words "corrosive sublimate."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move to strike out the proviso beginning in line 16, after the words "ad valorem," and including the rest of the paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STONE. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Rhode Island as to the amendment in paragraph 59. Was it agreed to?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; it has been agreed to.

Mr. STONE. I desire to suggest an amendment to that paragraph. I do not know whether to do it now or to do it later.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the Senator had better do it later in the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Very well.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I beg to inquire of the chairman of the committee to what articles the words in paragraph 63, "in the preparation of which alcohol is used," refer.

Mr. ALDRICH. That language has been stricken out.

Mr. DOLLIVER. It has been suggested that the operation might be to transfer from the free list certain articles in the manufacture of which alcohol is used, although alcohol does not appear in the finished product in any tangible form.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator probably has been informed about the products mentioned in lines 19, 20, and 21, which have been stricken out. That would not be true of the part of the paragraph which remains.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I notice the same phraseology in the main body of the paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not the same phraseology at all, if the Senator will look at it:

Medicinal preparations containing alcohol or in the preparation of which alcohol is used not specially provided for in this section.

The words "that all alkaloids, balsams, chemicals, drugs, extracts, medicinal substances, oils, salts, or similar substances whatever used for medicinal purposes, whether or not specifically provided for in this section, and whether on the dutiable list or the free list," have been stricken out on the suggestion of the committee.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I understand that the similar phraseology in the second line of the paragraph could not be construed to refer to articles now on the free list in the manufacture of which alcohol is used.

Mr. ALDRICH. Not possibly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next amendment passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 67, at the bottom of page 16, castile soap, etc.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee amendment to this paragraph has been agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee have an amendment to propose to the paragraph, which I ask may be read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Rhode Island from the committee.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to insert a new paragraph 67, as follows:

67. Castile soap, 14 cents per pound; medicinal or medicated soaps, 20 cents per pound; perfumed toilet soaps, 50 per cent ad valorem; all other soaps not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the substitute which the Secretary has read.

Mr. CULBERSON. Inasmuch as this amendment is presented by the Senator from Rhode Island on the floor, and not printed, I wish he would explain the changes made by it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The only change is to increase the rate on fancy perfumed soap, for revenue purposes. It does not change the rate upon anything else at all in the paragraph.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over was paragraph 69, on page 17.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that that paragraph may be passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be passed over. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 70. Crystal carbonate of soda, and so forth.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. There is no amendment to this paragraph. The next paragraph passed over will be read.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 71. Hydrate of, or caustic, soda, and so forth.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is not now in his seat. He asked to have this paragraph go over. I ask that it may still be passed over, until the Senator from Ohio is present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph will be passed over. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 79, on page 18. The committee reported to strike out the paragraph in the following words:

79. Sulphur, refined or sublimed, or flowers of, \$6 per ton.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

79. Sulphur, refined or sublimed, or flowers of sulphur; and sulphur or brimstone advanced beyond the original condition as mined, by melting, refining, or any process whatever by means of which impurities or extraneous matter, wholly or in part, have been removed, \$6 per ton.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee withdraw their amendment to paragraph 79, and ask to have the House provision amended by striking out "six" and inserting "four," so as to read:

Sulphur, refined or sublimed, or flowers of, \$4 per ton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The committee amendment to paragraph 79 is withdrawn. The Senator from Rhode Island now offers an amendment to the paragraph, which will be read by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. On page 18, line 10, before the word "dollars," strike out "six" and insert "four," so as to read:

79. Sulphur, refined or sublimed, or flowers of, \$4 per ton.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. When the Senate was considering the bill some days ago the amendment striking out paragraph 79 was agreed to, and the paragraph was stricken out.

Mr. ALDRICH. I now ask that the paragraph be agreed to with an amendment striking out "six" and inserting "four."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senate committee amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator explain the effect of the amendment he now proposes?

Mr. ALDRICH. It puts all crude sulphur on the free list and reduces the duty on refined sulphur from \$6 a ton to \$4 a ton.

Mr. SMOOT. The present rate is \$8, the committee reported \$6, and we now recommend a reduction to \$4.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment striking out "six" and inserting "four," so as to read "\$4 per ton."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next paragraph passed over will be read.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 83, page 19, Tiles: After the first word "Tiles," the committee reported to strike out the words "including quarries or quarry tiles, so called."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 15, after the word "tiles," the committee reported to insert the words "and tiling, by whatever name known."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 19, after the words "ad valorem," the committee reported to insert:

So-called quarries or quarry tiles, 35 per cent ad valorem; mantles, friezes, and all other articles of every description, composed wholly or in chief value of tiles or tiling, 60 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I take it that is merely an improved classification.

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; there are some other amendments to be offered.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. I send several amendments to the paragraph to the desk, which I ask may be read.

The SECRETARY. In line 14, strike out the word "ornamental" and insert in lieu thereof the word "ornamented."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 16, after the word "tiles" and before the comma, insert the words "and so-called quarries or quarry tiles."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 20, in the committee amendment, change the spelling of the word "mantles" so as to read "mantels."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In the same line, strike out the words "all other."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 85, page 20:
85. Lime, 5 cents per 100 pounds, including weight of barrel or package.

Mr. JONES. I ask that the paragraph be further passed over.
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph will be further passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 86. Plaster rock or gypsum—

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that the paragraph may be passed over. The committee have under consideration specific rates on a part of the articles.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 87. Pumice stone—

Mr. KEAN. I wish to ask whether the committee did not propose a reduction from \$6 a ton on pumice stone? That seems to be very high.

Mr. FLINT. I ask that the paragraph may go over.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the suggestion of the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. KEAN. I suggest that the duty be reduced.

Mr. ALDRICH. How much?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from California asks that the paragraph be passed over.

Mr. KEAN. To \$5 a ton, instead of \$6.

Mr. ALDRICH. It has gone over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The paragraph has been passed over. The next paragraph will be read.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 88, page 21, line 4, the committee propose to strike out "fifteen one-hundredths of 1 cent per pound on the bitumen content contained therein," and to insert:

Crude, if not dried, or otherwise advanced in any manner, \$1.50 per ton; if dried or otherwise advanced in any manner, \$3 per ton.

So as to read:

Asphaltum and bitumen, not specially provided for in this section, crude, if not dried, or otherwise advanced in any manner, \$1.50 per ton; if dried or otherwise advanced in any manner, \$3 per ton.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 88, line 12, after the word "spar," the committee report to insert "crude, or crushed, ground, or otherwise treated or manufactured," so as to read:

Fluor spar, crude, or crushed, ground, or otherwise treated or manufactured, \$1.50 per ton.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Kentucky desires to have this paragraph go over—that is, the part of the paragraph relating to the duty on fluor spar.

Mr. BRADLEY. Yes; that part of it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee suggest an amendment striking out, on page 20, line 25, after the word "asphalt," the words "containing not more than 15 per cent of bitumen."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROOT. Does not the word "asphalt" go out also?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understood not. The Chair asks the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island. The Senator from New York inquires whether the amendment striking out intended to include the word "asphalt."

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understood not.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. My attention was attracted away. I simply wish to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether this affects asphalt used in paving and for roads in any way? If it does, I ask that it be passed over for the present. I do not know that I shall have any objection to it, but I want to look into the matter.

Mr. ALDRICH. This particular asphalt is not imported. It is lime-rock asphalt. It is not of very great importance in any event, but the committee thought that the clause ought not to be in the bill, and I think the Senator will find—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I merely asked if it does affect asphalt used for pavement and roads.

Mr. ALDRICH. It does, and the amendments in lines 5, 6, and 7, on page 21, reduced the duty levied by the House about 50 per cent or more.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It does affect asphalt for roads.

Mr. ALDRICH. It reduces the duty largely.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator think that the duty might be reduced still further?

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator asks my personal opinion, perhaps I would say that it should be on the free list.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I suggest that it be passed over for the present.

Mr. ALDRICH. A great many desire that the rate shall be much higher than the rate suggested by the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It will be passed over for the present.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to call the attention of the Senate—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire will permit the Chair to inform the Senator from Indiana, so that there may be no misunderstanding, that this amendment was agreed to and there has been business subsequent. So the Chair thinks the request should be to reconsider, if the paragraph is to be passed over. Several matters have intervened since it was agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can bring it up in the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. In view of the fact that we are passing over these paragraphs again, I suggest that we pass it over. I do not know that I shall have any objection to it; I think I agree with the Senator that it ought to be on the free list, but let it be passed over with the rest.

Mr. ALDRICH. There is no reason why it should not be passed on now.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before it is passed over I wish to call attention to an excerpt from the New York Evening Post, which is a low-tariff newspaper, concerning asphalt. It says:

For many years prior to July 24, 1897, asphalt was on the free list, and the price of asphalt was steadily maintained at \$35 per ton and paving at from \$3 to \$4 per yard. Under the Dingley Act \$1.50 per ton duty has been paid on crude and \$3 per ton on refined. The market price of asphalt has fallen to about \$22 per ton and paving prices to \$1.50 to \$2 per yard. The Barber Paving Company, of Philadelphia, controlling the inexhaustible asphalt deposits of Trinidad and Venezuela, is practically the only importer of this material. It can produce, transport, refine, and deliver asphalt at New York for \$12 per ton, including payment of the present duty or the rate proposed in the Payne bill. It can pay four times the rate proposed in the Payne bill without advancing its selling price.

If this is correct there is one instance on record where taking an article from the free list and putting it on the dutiable list has resulted in a very remarkable reduction in the price.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That may be. We will consider it when it is taken up.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment on lines 4 to 8, on page 21, in paragraph 88, will be passed over, having been already agreed to. The Secretary will report the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 89. Mica—

Mr. CRAWFORD. I ask that paragraph 89 be passed over for the present.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope it will be passed over, because there is a great conflict of interest and of opinion upon this subject. A very large number of important people are anxious to have mica put on the free list, and some others want to have the rates increased even higher than the present law.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph will be passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think it is desirable, in view of the conflict of opinion, that the committee reexamine this case and see if it ought to go on the free list or whether it ought to be dutiable.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No objection being made, the paragraph will be passed over.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island for information. I simply request that if an additional amendment, different from those already proposed, is to be considered it may be offered so that we will have an opportunity to examine it. I understood that there was in contemplation another amendment to that paragraph, and if the committee are contemplating to do so by reporting it they would give us an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee are still undecided, but whenever they reach a conclusion on the subject, as to which of these conflicting interests is correct, or approximately correct, they will report an amendment. What the nature of the amendment will be no man can tell at this moment.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I will say, for the information of the Senator from South Dakota, that whenever this paragraph comes to be considered by the Senate I shall endeavor to show that the word "rough" used in the bill as sent to us by the House rather than the word "thumb," which the committee proposed to substitute, will result in a more equitable assessment of the duty upon the article mica.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee themselves are satisfied of that. They acted upon erroneous information in making the suggested change. As to what rate should be finally fixed, that is another question.

Mr. KEAN. I should like to ask the chairman if he could not make that change now?

Mr. ALDRICH. No.

Mr. GAMBLE. The House committee had a very full hearing on this paragraph, and it occurs to me that the House

draft is preferable to the amendment made by the Senate committee. I understood that the Finance Committee had an amendment to present to correct it, and I would be glad to hear it.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the producers of mica in the United States persuaded the committee to make the amendment which was suggested. They are now satisfied that they should not have made the change. Just what rate should finally be fixed upon mica is a subject about which I must confess we are very much at sea at this moment, and whether it should go on the free list or be made dutiable at any rate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I should like to have paragraph 58 passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 58 has been passed over.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Has it been passed over? I wanted to make the inquiry. I supposed it had been adopted.

Mr. ALDRICH. It was passed over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It was passed over the second time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It was passed over the second time?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Yes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was detained for two or three minutes in my committee room giving a hearing to some manufacturers and was not on the floor when that particular paragraph was reached. I supposed it had been adopted, and I wanted to return to it if that was true. If it was passed over, that is exactly the request that I desired to make. I understand, then, that paragraph 58, page 14, is passed over the second time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so stated.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 90—

Mr. DICK. I request that the paragraph dealing with earthenware and china be passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; we have to get ahead, and we might as well decide the question now as at any other time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee propose to strike out, on page 21, paragraph 90, as printed in the House text, and to insert a new paragraph 90, as follows:

90. Common yellow, brown, or gray earthenware, plain, embossed, or salt-glazed common stoneware, and crucibles, all the foregoing not decorated in any manner, 25 per cent ad valorem; Rockingham earthenware, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will modify that amendment by inserting the words which I send to the desk.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 22, line 4, in the committee amendment, after the word "and" and before the word "crucibles," insert the words "earthenware or stoneware," so as to read:

90. Common yellow, brown, or gray earthenware, plain, embossed, or salt-glazed common stoneware, and earthenware or stoneware crucibles, all the foregoing not decorated in any manner, 25 per cent ad valorem; Rockingham earthenware, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 91. China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware. The committee propose after the word "ware," in line 9, to strike out "ornamented, decorated, painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, brown white lined, or printed, and" and to insert the word "including."

Mr. BACON. I was endeavoring when the last amendment acted on was before the Senate to ascertain what relation the duty proposed in that amendment bears to the present law. I see from a reference that it is an increase, is it not?

Mr. ALDRICH. No, sir.

Mr. BACON. I was mistaken, then, in looking at the wrong line. I had the wrong line.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a reduction on both items below the House bill, and a large reduction in some cases.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In this connection I should like to ask the chairman whether it is a reduction upon the products included in the amendment which the Senator from Rhode Island proposed this morning to that paragraph, immediately preceding the word "crucibles?"

Mr. ALDRICH. That only describes the crucibles and the character of crucibles that are to be included in the paragraph.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it a reduction?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; it is the same rate on crucibles.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And that is the rate—

Mr. ALDRICH. Of the existing law.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of the existing law?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, of course I am satisfied that the Senator is correct, because he has given careful study to it. At the same time, so far as I can identify the present rate, it seems to be the same as that in the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. The House provisions, if the Senator will read them, fix a rate on common yellow, brown, or gray earthenware, of common clay and strictly one color, at 25 per cent. If they had two colors, they would pay 60 per cent.

Mr. BACON. That is the present law?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; that is the House provision. It makes all common earthenware that contains more than one color 60 per cent ad valorem. The committee amendment reduces that rate from 60 to 40 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. It brings it back to the Dingley rate.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is a reduction of 20 per cent ad valorem. The House provision makes a reduction on Rockingham earthenware not decorated of 40 per cent ad valorem, but makes decorated Rockingham earthenware dutiable at 60 per cent. The amendment of the committee make it all dutiable at 40 per cent.

Mr. BACON. So the change is—

Mr. ALDRICH. A reduction, so far as those varieties are concerned.

Mr. BACON. So far as those two articles are concerned.

Mr. BURTON. Do I understand that paragraph 91 has been passed over?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The pending question is on the amendment to paragraph 91.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next amendment reported by the committee is in paragraph 91, which the Secretary will state.

The SECRETARY. On page 22, line 13, after the word "lamps," insert "all the foregoing."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BACON. I beg pardon. I do not wish to unduly delay the proceeding in any manner, but the paragraph which we rapidly passed over a moment ago relates to a very large part of the commonly used crockery, does it not?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; it does not. Paragraph 92 refers to that class of articles. Paragraph 90 refers to a very small and relatively unimportant amount of common yellow, brown, or gray earthenware which the Senator, I suppose, has never seen. Perhaps he saw it in his boyhood days in some of the cabins of the South, but I imagine he never sees it now, and probably he has not seen it for fifteen or twenty years.

Mr. BACON. I am not interested in what may not be of general use. I interrupted, thinking this might relate to something in general use.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 92 is the paragraph that refers to matters in general use.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question of the chairman of the committee. Do you not think that there ought to be some difference between the ad valorem duty upon china ware and the duty upon earthenware, in view of the history of those kinds of business in the United States? As I understand these two paragraphs, 91 and 92, they attach the same duty to earthenware as to china ware—55 per cent ad valorem if undecorated and 60 per cent ad valorem if decorated in any way. My own observation, which is corroborated by some evidence I have read, is that the china-ware industry of the United States very much needs all the protection we have given it, and possibly more. Substantially all of the china ware—I modify that a trifle, and will say that I believe that two-thirds of the china ware used in the United States is imported, whereas I understand that about 80 per cent or more of all the earthenware used in the United States is of domestic manufacture. It would seem to me that the history of the development of our business in china ware and in earthenware ought to indicate that either the duty on china ware should be somewhat increased, or the duty on earthenware should be somewhat diminished. I am inclined to the latter view.

I have in preparation an amendment which I expect to offer to these two paragraphs, separating them in classification; but I have not been able to complete the preparation of the amendment. I am not ready to offer it at this time, but I shall do so when the paragraphs are under consideration by the Senate. I shall be very glad to have the knowledge or the opinion of the chairman of the Finance Committee as to the propriety of making a difference between the duty on china ware and the duty on earthenware.

Mr. DICK. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?
The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. DICK. Does the Senator intend by his proposed amendment to increase the rate on either of these articles?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not.

Mr. DICK. Is it the intention of the amendment to reduce the rate on one of the articles?

Mr. CUMMINS. It will reduce the rate on earthenware, but it will not reduce the rate on chinaware. I thought this was an appropriate time to get the opinion of the committee with regard to the comparative necessity of duties upon one or the other of these classes of commodities.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, earthenware is made dutiable by the paragraph which we have just concluded at 40 per cent ad valorem. Earthenware which is decorated may not be at all distinguishable from china which is decorated. The intention of the law is, and has been, to make any of these products that are decorated pay the same rate of duty. There is no other way, in my judgment, in which the duty can be collected except by making them all dutiable at the same rate, whether they are made of earthenware or of china or of whatever they are made. All these are interchangeable names, and I imagine there is no man who can tell the difference practically between a great many of these articles. It is almost impossible to tell whether an article that is decorated is made from earthenware or from china. It is simply a great mass of materials, of different weights usually, it is true, but all of similar values, and they all should be dutiable at the same rate. That has been the experience in the past; and, in my judgment, there should be no change whatever in that respect.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not understand the subject exactly as described by the chairman of the committee. There is a very marked difference, I believe, between earthenware, stoneware, and chinaware. I will not, however, attempt to give the technical difference. I think, however, that it is easily appreciated; and paragraph 90 does not carry at all the common white earthenware. You will observe that it provides:

Common yellow, brown, or gray earthenware, etc.

Paragraph 91 provides:

China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware.

Classifying them all together. It is true that that provides for those various classes, if decorated, paying a duty of 60 per cent; but paragraph 92 has the same classification, which embraces common white earthenware not decorated, paying a duty of 55 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me for a moment?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, from time immemorial—I do not know how far back—this classification has been unchanged. In 1833 the same language was used.

China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, including clock cases, etc.

And the rate was the same. In 1890 the same classification was adopted; in 1894, under the Wilson bill in the House, the exactly same classification was adopted, and it was also in the act of 1897. So, for twenty-six years, in five different tariff revisions there has been no change whatever in the classification.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is precisely why I am now making the inquiry. I know there has been no change in the classification. What has been the result?

Mr. ALDRICH. Under the Wilson bill we reduced the rates, of course, but under the act of 1883 the rates were 60 per cent and 55 per cent, the same as now. In 1890, and also in 1897, the rates were the same.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the classification was fixed in 1883.

Mr. ALDRICH. The classification was fixed in 1883, and has remained without change from that time to this. I have never heretofore heard any criticism from anybody whatever to the effect that the classification ought to be changed.

Mr. BACON. What was the rate under the Wilson bill, I ask the Senator? I have sent for the book, but I have it not before me here.

Mr. ALDRICH. The rate was 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. CUMMINS. I should like to hear the Senator from Georgia, but I can not quite do so at this distance.

Mr. BACON. I inquired of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], as he had the figures before him, what was the rate on this article under the Wilson bill, and I understood him to reply that it was 35 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. On decorated, and 30 per cent on the plain.

Mr. CUMMINS. I again suggest that the classification is a very old one; but the experience or the history of the business to which these paragraphs relate shows that the classification is not the right one, because under it the china-ware industry has not prospered, while under it the earthenware industry has very greatly prospered. I therefore reiterate the conclusion that the duty on china ware is too low or the duty on earthenware is too high. I am not, however, at this time ready to offer the amendment which I should like to propose, but I shall do so when the bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Does the Senator ask that the paragraph go over?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. DICK] has asked that it go over.

Mr. DICK. I withdrew the request.

Mr. ALDRICH. I wish merely to suggest that the Senator from Iowa can easily offer his amendment in the Senate. I desire that this paragraph be now acted upon.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is, that these two paragraphs be adopted. I renew the request heretofore made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DICK]. I should be very glad to have the opportunity to offer my amendment later; and I will try to get it. It may be that when I have investigated the source of information which I now understand exists, I may not ask that any amendment be made; but, as at present advised, I shall do so.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] has the floor. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to ask the Senator if he understands, as I suppose he does, that he will have the opportunity of offering his amendment in the Senate? So he will lose nothing and gain nothing by having it adopted now.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that. I have no particular desire to have the amendment passed here; but I thought it was only fair—

Mr. CULBERSON. With reference to the suggestion of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], with the permission of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS] I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand this bill is now being considered with reference to committee amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is also being considered with reference to agreeing to the House provisions.

Mr. CULBERSON. When we conclude the consideration of the committee amendments, I understand that individual Senators not connected with the committee may offer amendments anywhere in the bill while it is being considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Not to a committee amendment if it has been adopted by the Senate, except on a reconsideration.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask, if that is not the case, when can a Senator offer an amendment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. When the consideration of committee amendments has been concluded any Senator may offer an amendment to any portion of the bill—

Mr. CULBERSON. In Committee of the Whole?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In Committee of the Whole. But if a Senator proposes an amendment to an amendment which has been agreed to, it can only be accomplished by a reconsideration.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. And an amendment can then be offered—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To any other portion of the bill an amendment can then be offered.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is still in order for any Senator to offer any amendment he wishes to paragraph 91.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does that mean that before the bill passes into the Senate a Senator may not offer an amendment to this paragraph—

Mr. ALDRICH. Except—

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment—which does not involve the amendment of the Committee on Finance which has been adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It means that any Senator may offer such an amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely.

Mr. ALDRICH. But he may not, after the Senate has agreed to a House provision as amended by the Senate, except upon a reconsideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That is correct.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The only time a Senator would then have an opportunity to offer an amendment to that committee amendment would be when it gets into the Senate; but he

may in Committee of the Whole offer an amendment to any other portion of the bill except the adopted committee amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask that this paragraph be agreed to.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. BACON. I thought that the Senator had finished. I will wait until he does so.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I have already stated that I shall offer an amendment of the character I have suggested, if, upon further investigation, I find my present impressions are verified by the facts.

Mr. BACON. I wish to recall to the Senate that a few days ago, when this very question was under consideration in the Senate, I suggested that the universal custom of the Senate had been, in the consideration of appropriation bills and other lengthy bills, to have the committee in charge of the bill go through the bill and have their amendments acted upon; and that, under a very liberal practice, though not according to strict parliamentary usage, it had always been the custom after that had been done to go back and have Senators offer any amendments they desired to any part of the bill, whether amendments had been agreed to or not. That was consented to; and I am sure I can turn to the Record and show it. Still I do not care what is done, so that we understand what is to be relied upon.

Mr. ALDRICH. If this paragraph is now agreed to by the Senate as amended, it will only then be in order to offer an amendment when the bill reaches the Senate or upon a motion to reconsider. It seems to me that ought to be perfectly plain to everybody.

Mr. BACON. That is not the way in which we usually act.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is the way we always act.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. BACON. I yield to the Senator if he wishes to suggest an inquiry to me.

Mr. McLAURIN. I want to make a suggestion in reference to what was suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island. I do not claim to be a parliamentarian, but I want to understand if we are to adopt this bill paragraph by paragraph?

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly, as they are reached.

Mr. McLAURIN. I understood that we were reading the bill—

Mr. ALDRICH. The bill has been read at length.

Mr. McLAURIN. I understood then that we were to adopt the amendments to the paragraphs, but not to adopt paragraph by paragraph. That has not been my understanding of the agreement all along. I understood that we would first adopt the committee amendments, and then Senators would be allowed to offer any amendments to the bill which suggested themselves to them.

Mr. ALDRICH. We would never get through the bill under such an arrangement.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will allow me, my recollection is very clear—

Mr. McLAURIN. I am on the floor by the courtesy of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON].

Mr. HALE. We went through the entire bill, but passed over certain paragraphs, acting upon some committee amendments and passing over others. That exhausted the agreement. Then we went back, and the chairman of the committee is now bringing before the Senate the entire bill, not simply committee amendments, for we have been over that stage once.

Undoubtedly when a provision is adopted we make that much progress. When we vote upon an amendment and agree to it, and thereby incorporate it as a part of the bill, it can only be reached in the Senate, where every Senator's right is plenary, or by a reconsideration; otherwise we would never make any progress. I hope the chairman will insist upon that course. We are now considering the whole bill, not simply committee amendments.

Mr. McLAURIN. There are others who will insist, but let me give my understanding of the status of this matter. [We went through the bill and read it for committee amendments.]

Mr. ALDRICH. No—

Mr. McLAURIN. That is what was stated; and I understood it to be for committee amendments. Many committee amendments were adopted; but no amendment could be offered by any individual Senator—

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

Mr. McLAURIN. Just a word. Let me finish now, and then I will hear the Senator from Maine. When the committee

amendments were being adopted, it was understood that no Senator could offer any amendment, except an amendment to the committee amendment. I think that is correct. That is my understanding; and I think that is parliamentary usage. During the first reading of the bill a great many paragraphs were passed over, and we have now gone back—

Mr. HALE. And are taking them up.

Mr. McLAURIN. To take those paragraphs up; and they are taken up as upon the first reading of the bill, and not the second reading of the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. McLAURIN. It is bound to be so. It can not be otherwise, because the paragraphs were not all read.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator can offer an amendment now.

Mr. ALDRICH. The paragraphs were all read.

Mr. HALE. Every line of the bill was read in order that we might not have to read it afterwards.

Mr. McLAURIN. The paragraphs were passed over for the very purpose of allowing committee amendments.

Mr. LODGE. All passed-over paragraphs were read; every one of them.

Mr. McLAURIN. Well, they were passed over for the purpose of allowing committee amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no.

Mr. LODGE. Amendments were in order.

Mr. McLAURIN. But not any amendments except to the committee amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am not mistaken about what was stated at the time. I may be mistaken about what Senators intended to state; but I am not mistaken about what was actually stated, because it was stated that when we got through with the committee amendments we could then offer amendments to the bill and offer amendments to the paragraphs. We have passed a good many paragraphs to which I intended to offer amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. We voted last night on two different amendments to committee amendments.

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly; amendments to committee amendments is what I say.

Mr. ALDRICH. But an amendment to a paragraph outside of the committee amendment is just as much in order.

Mr. McLAURIN. I have not so understood; and I have permitted a number of paragraphs to go by to which I wanted to offer amendments.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator will not lose any of his rights. No Senator will lose any right, because he can offer amendments to the bill in the Senate or can ask to have a reconsideration.

Mr. McLAURIN. But I do lose my right if I have to have an amendment reconsidered before I can offer an amendment to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. We are now proceeding under the ordinary rules which control parliamentary proceedings in the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. As modified by the agreement of the Senate.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is as to the first reading, but not as to any present reading.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The first reading has been concluded. This is a subsequent reading.

Mr. ALDRICH. That agreement has exhausted itself by limitation of time.

Mr. McLAURIN. That is not my understanding. The paragraphs passed over were passed over as if the committee amendments were to be offered afterwards and first acted upon. We could not act upon the paragraphs until the committee amendments were acted upon; and that settles the question.

Mr. BACON. I understand, then, according to the statement of the Senator in charge of the bill, that if any Senator desires to offer an amendment to a rate of duty he must do so now.

Mr. ALDRICH. Certainly.

Mr. BACON. And not wait and expect to get it up afterwards, unless he wishes to ask for the committee's amendment to be considered.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly; and to the paragraph now under consideration I think any Member of the Senate has a right to offer any amendment he sees fit.

Mr. BACON. Very well. Then we are not expected to wait until the committee amendments have been acted upon before offering amendments to amendments?

Mr. ALDRICH. No. The only suggestion that I am making is that the committee amendments should be acted upon first; but they are always, of course, susceptible to amendment.

Mr. BACON. Susceptible to amendment at the time?

Mr. ALDRICH. At the time, yes; but not after the Senate has adopted them, unless on reconsideration.

Mr. BACON. But if a paragraph as thus amended is adopted, subsequent to that time, as I understand, any Senator may offer an amendment to the paragraph, so that he does not propose to amend an amendment already adopted.

Mr. ALDRICH. Unless it has been adopted by the Senate. If it has been, it is necessary to move a reconsideration.

Mr. BACON. I can not turn to it now, but I will turn to the Record and show that that is not the agreement which we made last week; but I will, so far as I am concerned, act upon that for the present at least. I do not, however, wish to be foreclosed from the liberty and opportunity of reading what has heretofore been agreed to on that subject; but, not to delay the Senate now, I will pass on and observe the rule for the present; and I am going to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 91 is pending, but no amendment to it has yet been stated.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There is a slight misapprehension here. I thought there was none until this moment. It was my understanding that we were now acting upon committee amendments, to which any Senator might offer an amendment, and if the committee amendment was adopted it could not thereafter be amended until the bill gets into the Senate; but I did not understand that we were also acting upon the paragraphs.

Mr. ALDRICH. Unquestionably we are.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, it appears that the Senator is asking not only that the committee amendments be adopted, but also that the entire paragraph shall be acted upon at this time. Therefore, the Senate is in this situation—I merely state it so that the matter may be understood, for I know some Senators, including myself, have become somewhat confused—the Senate is in this situation: Hereafter, after a paragraph is adopted, not only can the committee amendments not be amended until the bill gets into the Senate, except upon a reconsideration, but the same is true of the entire paragraph as well as of the committee amendments. So that, if a Senator has anything he wants to offer, it should be presented now or he should wait until the bill gets into the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. Do I understand the adoption of a committee amendment adopts the whole paragraph?

Mr. ALDRICH. Not at all. I asked that the paragraph as amended be agreed to, and that is the pending question, subject, of course, to amendment by any Senator. That is perfectly plain, it seems to me.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether in the consideration of the bill the paragraphs now before the Senate have all been agreed to?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Except those passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. Except those passed over. Where they have been read, and no amendment of any kind has been suggested, they have been adopted and stand, unless the Senate agrees by a vote to reconsider those paragraphs. Of course, that makes a different question. I assume that they have all been agreed to; but whether they have been agreed to or not, if there is any Senator who feels that he is losing any right or who wants to offer any amendment, even after we get through, there will be no trouble, I take it, in securing either a reconsideration or an opportunity to go into it when the bill gets into the Senate. I am not trying to foreclose Senators from offering amendments, but I realize that, if we finish this bill ever, we must go on and close everything up unless it is to be opened hereafter by a vote of the Senate.

Mr. McLAURIN. There has not been, so far as I have heard, a single paragraph that has been submitted to the Senate. Amendment after amendment has been submitted, and amendment after amendment has been agreed to, but there has not been a proposition to agree to a paragraph or to adopt a paragraph, so far as I have heard, since this bill has been read.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the very course—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. That is the understanding now.

Mr. McLAURIN. It may be hereafter, but the paragraphs heretofore read have never been adopted.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say that all the rights of the Senator from Mississippi and of any other Senator are reserved. There is no disposition to foreclose any Senator, but the Senator from Mississippi must realize that we have got to make progress with this bill if we ever expect to finish it.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am just as desirous of expediting this bill as is the Senator from Rhode Island. I should like to get a vote on it to-morrow, if I could do so; but I do not want to be precluded from offering amendments to paragraphs that have been read and passed over and that have not been adopted. If we are served with notice that hereafter we must present our amendments at the time when a paragraph is under con-

sideration, that is all right; but there have been no paragraphs adopted to this time, up to paragraph 91.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Mississippi has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I was merely going to suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that it is the universal parliamentary practice that in reading a bill a paragraph or section is adopted on the reading, unless an amendment is offered or objection made.

Mr. McLAURIN. Adopted by the fact of reading?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; the reading is sufficient.

Mr. McLAURIN. I have never heard of that before.

Mr. LODGE. In the case of every appropriation bill that goes from that desk and passes the Senate, as a paragraph or section is read, if there is no amendment and no objection to it, the reading carries that paragraph, and nothing remains but the final question on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McLAURIN. It never has been so that I have ever heard.

Mr. LODGE. I think that is the universal rule of parliamentary bodies.

Mr. McLAURIN. It has never been so since I have had a place in this body.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. McLAURIN. With pleasure.

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not want to prolong this discussion—I think it is very inconsequential—but I want to suggest to the Senator that those of us—

Mr. McLAURIN. I suggest to the Senator that he ought not to get into an "inconsequential" discussion.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will take but a moment. Of course I will not interrupt the Senator if he does not wish to be interrupted.

Mr. McLAURIN. Oh, certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was merely about to remark, Mr. President, that in dealing with appropriation bills we have pursued precisely the course that we ought to adopt in connection with this bill; that is to say, the bill is read; the amendments then are acted upon—

Mr. BULKELEY. It is impossible to hear the debate. There is too much noise in the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. GALLINGER. I will talk a little louder. The bill is read; amendments are afterwards acted upon; they can be amended from the floor when they are being acted upon; but after that they are only open again by motion to reconsider or when the bill gets into the Senate. The Senator will perceive that, if we never settle one of these items, we will never get through the bill. That is the universal rule in dealing with appropriation bills, and this bill is similar to an appropriation bill. Any Senator can offer an amendment to a committee amendment, or he can offer an amendment to a paragraph. If a paragraph is amended, then the Chair ought to put the question upon agreeing to that paragraph as amended. If the Chair has failed to do that, it has been an oversight.

Mr. ALDRICH and Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Chair has done that.

Mr. GALLINGER. I presume the Chair has done that.

Mr. McLAURIN. I take the liberty to dissent from that. The Chair has not submitted anything so far except the amendments.

Mr. GALLINGER. If we will pursue the course I have indicated, I am sure we shall have no trouble.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McLAURIN. With pleasure.

Mr. TILLMAN. Last week I asked for a reprint of this bill, in order to be able to get some light. When I got the bill on my desk and wanted to know what had been done and what was being proposed to be done, I found there was nothing done in that particular except to furnish me with a bill with some pencil marks on it. Now I notice that we are passing over paragraphs again. We have passed over paragraphs once, and we are going back and passing them over again. Why do we not commence to build from the ground and finish this bill? What is the use of fooling around here? We have fooled around for three weeks, passing over paragraphs and then going back and passing them again. I want to get away from here. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. I want to ask the Senator—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. McLAURIN. With pleasure.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the object of the roll calls that we have had if we have not adopted these paragraphs?

Mr. McLAURIN. The object of the roll calls was to pass on amendments. They were not to pass on the paragraphs. The Senator ought to know that.

Mr. SCOTT. After the amendments were adopted, the Chair announced that the paragraph was adopted.

Mr. McLAURIN. No, sir; the Chair never has announced that. The Chair announced that the particular amendment was adopted, but the Chair would not have been authorized to announce the adoption of a paragraph merely because there was a vote adopting an amendment to it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator will let us go on with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McLAURIN. I have not disturbed its consideration much. The Senator will give me credit for having been very brief in what I have had to say here.

I have let a great many go by where I should have liked to put in my oar. But I wanted to expedite matters. I think the Senator will bear me out that I have been pretty patient. I have not said much. I have not delayed the bill at all.

What I wanted to say was that in 1894, when we adopted the Wilson bill, it was read, and the committee amendments were adopted. It was read for committee amendments, and after the committee amendments were adopted Senators were permitted to offer amendments anywhere they pleased to the bill; and after they were voted upon, either adopted or rejected, we voted upon the whole bill, and it was carried into the Senate, and certain amendments were reserved on which Senators desired a special vote. I think that is the proper course here, but if the Senate prefers to adopt paragraph by paragraph, that is perfectly satisfactory to me. However, I want to know what we are doing as we are going on.

While I am on my feet I propose to say—

Mr. CULBERSON. Will the Senator permit me to read a paragraph from the Record?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. CULBERSON. It shows our understanding that the Senate might go back and consider amendments to the whole bill offered by individual Senators in Committee of the Whole. I read a brief extract from page 1512 of the RECORD, April 23. The Vice-President said:

The Chair has repeatedly stated, when a request has been made that a paragraph be passed over after amendments have been agreed to, that the paragraph is passed over with the amendments agreed to; and therefore the Chair is desirous that it shall be understood now whether the amendments shall be considered as agreed to or not agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. But it is also understood that the Senate can go back and make any amendments they please to the text.

Mr. CULBERSON. I was going to make the statement made by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is what we are doing now.

Mr. LODGE. That is precisely what we are doing now.

Mr. CULBERSON. We are considering amendments of the committee—

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no—

Mr. LODGE. Every paragraph as reached is open to amendment.

Mr. CULBERSON. A great many Senators who have amendments to offer have not offered them at all. They were going on the understanding that individual Senators could offer amendments later on, when the committee had perfected the bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. They can offer them now if they want to, and if there is any amendment about which any Senator thinks he has lost any rights, I am perfectly willing that a motion to reconsider shall be entertained. But we must make some progress, and the interminable discussion over what we ought to do or agreed to do last week or last month—

Mr. TILLMAN. Let us agree to do something now.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let us agree to do something now, as the Senator from South Carolina says, and if the Senate adopts this provision it will be open for reconsideration or open for amendment in the Senate.

Mr. McLAURIN. While I am on my feet I want to make one suggestion in reference to what was said by the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER]. It seems that that Senator is exclusively interested in the question how this will affect the china manufacturers and the earthenware manufacturers. My idea is we ought to give some little consideration to the people who purchase these wares, and have them classified differently, because the men who use china ware are a great deal better able to pay a high price for it than are the people who use earthenware. The people who use earthenware are the people who are generally what we call the "plain people," of whom I am one, the

laboring people of the country, and they use this earthenware, and they ought not to be taxed as high as the man who uses china ware. The consumer is the man to be considered, and not the man who makes china ware or earthenware.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Chair may have the attention of the Senate for a moment, the Chair would like to ask if there is any objection to its now being understood that the agreement is as very clearly stated by the Senator from Indiana? In the absence of objection—

Mr. BACON. I have no objection to its being considered as in force from now on, but as to the part of the bill which has been passed over, without that understanding, clearly Senators ought to have the opportunity to offer such amendments as they see fit.

Mr. ALDRICH. I tried to state as clearly as I could that if any amendment had been agreed to I will myself make the motion to reconsider, if any Senator desires it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair hears no objection, then?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I suggest that the Chair make the statement, so that there may be no confusion about it hereafter.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Indiana has stated it very clearly.

Mr. LODGE. We are proceeding under general parliamentary law and the rules of the Senate.

Mr. TILLMAN. In order to clarify the situation, as we have passed over 19 pages, let it be understood that any Senator may put in any amendment he desires, and we will vote on it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have asked, for the committee, that certain paragraphs be passed over, because the committee is still seeking information. There are some of these questions—

Mr. TILLMAN. I do not suppose that the committee will not have the right to amend the bill whenever it sees fit. But I want to get the others straight here. I should like to get this thing started on some kind of a gait that will get us through.

Mr. ALDRICH. There can be no possible misunderstanding as to the future. As to items passed over, I agree again that if any Senator thinks he has been precluded by the understanding from offering an amendment, I will see he has an opportunity to offer his amendment.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts asked for recognition before the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I want to submit a request—

Mr. LODGE. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (continuing). If I may be permitted to do so, I simply want to request that the Senate Committee on Finance, in so far as possible, should submit proposed amendments to the Senate in advance and let them be printed, so the Senate may have an opportunity to see in what respect they modify the report of the bill as made by the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. I shall be very glad to do that in cases where there is any possibility of misunderstanding what we suggest. As to these verbal amendments, where there is no question about what they mean, I suppose no Senator will ask that.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I do not intend that. But it is difficult when an amendment is sent up and read from the desk to determine exactly what its effect may be upon a given paragraph without a little study.

Mr. ALDRICH. In any case where they are important, or where any Senator thinks they are important, we will certainly do it.

Mr. LODGE. I simply wanted to say a word on the question of classification.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If the Senator will permit, the Chair will again put the proposition: Does the Senate now agree with the mode of procedure suggested by the Senator from Indiana? The Chair hears no—

Mr. BACON. I do not want it to be put in the shape of a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. LODGE. I think we had better not have any agreement.

Mr. BACON. So long as it is understood without any unanimous consent, I think it is sufficient.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. An agreement was once reached, and there seems to be some misunderstanding as to what that agreement was.

Mr. BACON. The Chair misunderstands me. I am not taking issue on that, but there is a custom of making what we call "unanimous-consent agreements"—

Mr. LODGE. There is none here.

Mr. BACON (continuing). Which are very rigidly adhered to and which are not open to subsequent change in any particular. I simply wish to guard against what the Chair is now suggesting as being construed into a unanimous-consent agreement. I have no objection to having it understood as a mere agreement. That is very different from a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. FRYE. Why should not the proceedings under this bill be governed now by the parliamentary law and the rules of the Senate?

Mr. LODGE. That is what I suggest.

Mr. FRYE. No other agreement is necessary. Those are well settled and well understood.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. As long as that is understood, it is very easy to proceed with the consideration of the bill, and the Chair understands that is now understood, what heretofore may have been understood.

Mr. LODGE. There is no agreement or understanding beyond that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. There has been one heretofore.

Mr. LODGE. I object to any unanimous consent on this matter. Let us proceed under the rules and the parliamentary law.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No one is asking for unanimous consent. When this bill was first taken up everybody knows what occurred, and there was an understanding, not a unanimous consent agreement. That has been changed.

Mr. LODGE. It is not necessary to discuss that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Senators are not going to take suggestions from the Senator from Massachusetts as to what they see fit to discuss.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The understanding is, then, that we proceed under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. LODGE. I believe I have the floor.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor, and has had it.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Massachusetts yield to me for a moment?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. It seems to me the situation is very simple. After a paragraph has been amended and agreed to, then I think the Chair should put the question "Shall the paragraph as amended be agreed to?" And if no objection is heard, the Chair can state that the paragraph is agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. That has been done this morning on every paragraph, I think.

I desire to say a word simply on the question of classification raised by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from Mississippi. The fact that a classification is old, running through a series of acts passed by different parties, is not an objection to the classification. It is a strong presumption in its favor, because all of these classifications have been the subject of regulation. They have been the subject of decision by the courts, and they are established classifications. Unless they lead to evasions and litigation, they ought to remain.

This classification is an old, established, and understood one, understood by the trade, understood by the manufacturer, understood by the courts, and thoroughly settled. The common earthenwares in paragraph 90 are those of the cheapest kinds. The duties on them have been reduced by the Senate committee, omitting the words "one color" from the first description, and the words "not decorated" from Rockingham china. The earthenware and the stoneware referred to by the Senator from Iowa in paragraphs 91 and 92 are the decorated or the glossed. They are carried to a point where they are indistinguishable in many instances; where the stoneware is absolutely indistinguishable from what is ordinarily called "china." There is a difference, no doubt, but those fine stonewares pass as china; and the only practicable classification that has been possible in justice both to the manufacturer and the importer, who both agree on the classification, is to maintain the existing classification. The differential between decorated and plain white has been maintained at 5 per cent in this bill, as well as all the others.

Whether the duty should be 60 and 65 is another question, or whether it should be 30 and 35. But that the difference is correctly stated and that the classification is the best that can be arrived at on these articles are proved by experience and by the testimony of all the experts and the appraisers of the customhouse.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I intend to defer such suggestions as I have to make with regard to classification until I am permitted to introduce an amendment that I shall present, but I simply desire to say that the matter of classification was

first brought to my attention by a very well-known merchant of Boston, who insists that the classification is unscientific and does great injustice to the trade.

Mr. KEAN. What did he suggest?

Mr. CUMMINS. At the proper time I will offer an amendment.

Mr. LODGE. The representatives of the great importers of china, including one of the largest in Boston, appeared before the committee and found no fault with the classification, although they did find fault with the rate.

Mr. BACON. Paragraph 90 is now under consideration?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Paragraph 90 is now under consideration.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I am not going to do anything more than to offer an amendment to these several paragraphs.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Georgia will permit, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Finance, so as to be clearly informed, whether if we agree on paragraph 91 its adoption is final, and it can not be recurred to without a motion to reconsider? I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ALDRICH. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I want to ask the chairman of the Finance Committee whether from now on we will consider the bill by paragraphs, and if a paragraph is adopted, it will be final, and we can not recur to that paragraph without a motion to reconsider?

Mr. ALDRICH. Or in the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Very good. What about the paragraphs we have passed upon up to this time? On that there is a misunderstanding.

Mr. ALDRICH. I have tried to state it several times. If passed over on the request of the committee, they will be taken up some time in the future. If passed over at the request of a Senator, they will be taken up later. No Senator will lose any right.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Those that have been passed over can be taken up again?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Rhode Island has stated that in case any Senator feels that his right is in jeopardy in any way, he will agree to a reconsideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia was about to present an amendment.

Mr. BACON. The articles which are specified in paragraph 91, as stated by the Senator from Rhode Island, are articles embracing a very small number—

Mr. ALDRICH. In 90.

Mr. BACON. I misunderstood the Senator, and that is the reason I rose. I think that the articles specified in paragraphs 91 and 92 ought to pay but a low rate of duty. They are the articles which are used in every household in the United States, from the very poorest people up to those in moderate circumstances. It may not include in any great degree china of a very expensive kind, but there is no doubt about the fact, if I read it correctly, that the articles specified in paragraphs 91 and 92 are the articles used in every household, down to the very poorest people, and from them up to people in good circumstances. I think the duties specified on the articles in those two paragraphs should be very materially reduced. I find by looking at the imports that they are comparatively small.

Mr. LODGE. They are very large, indeed.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator must have looked at the wrong place.

Mr. BACON. I may be wrong, but on page 11 of this document, "Comparative estimated revenues," I find that—

Mr. LODGE. On the most expensive the revenue is over \$5,000,000.

Mr. BACON. Paragraph 92 is what I had. The revenue under paragraph 91, on the most expensive china, is over \$5,000,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. The importations averaged—

Mr. BACON. I refer to the next page, under paragraph 92, where of the first class the entire importation is only \$300,000. Under paragraph 91 the importation of plain white is put down at \$1,000,000; not revenue, but importations.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is 92.

Mr. BACON. Ninety-one is put down at \$1,049,218.43.

Mr. LODGE. That comes under 92 in the present bill. That is the present classification.

Mr. BACON. I understood the classification was the same. Mr. LODGE. Importations were a million, and under that the revenue was \$577,070.15.

Mr. BACON. Exactly. I say it is a very small importation as against what must be a very large production in this country.

Mr. LODGE. Expensive chinaware are those that yield the revenue; they are the proper subjects. They are the most expensive.

Mr. BACON. I do not know; that may be. Some of it is expensive. A large majority is not china, but common crockery. I move to amend that paragraph as follows—

Mr. LODGE. This is 91.

Mr. BACON. Ninety-one. That includes china, porcelain—

Mr. LODGE. That is, the decorated china.

Mr. BACON (continuing). And crockery ware, and so forth, painted, tinted, stained, enameled, printed, gilded, or otherwise decorated in any manner. The plainest and simplest of crockery ware having the slightest decoration is under this provision put at a duty of 60 per cent ad valorem. I move to strike out "sixty" and insert "thirty-five."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 22, line 18, before the words "per cent," it is proposed to strike out "sixty" and insert "thirty-five."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, just what does that affect?

Mr. BACON. I did not understand the question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BACON. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TILLMAN. I ask that the question be again stated.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will again state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 22, in paragraph 91, line 18, before the words "per cent," it is proposed to strike out "sixty" and insert "thirty-five."

Mr. BACON. I desire to state that the next paragraph is the one which relates to the perfectly plain proposition, and upon that I propose to offer an amendment, after this is acted upon, which will put that in at thirty, making a distinction between plain and decorated.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Before we take a vote on the amendment, I wish some one familiar with the earthenware schedule would make a statement on the subject.

Mr. ALDRICH. The amendment which the Senator from Georgia proposes is on decorated ware, of which, in 1907, there were \$9,000,000 imported and \$5,000,000 of duty collected. The importation in 1907—

Mr. NELSON. I wish the Senator from Rhode Island would speak a little louder.

Mr. ALDRICH. I said that the paragraph which the Senator proposes to reduce from 60 to 35 per cent is the paragraph pertaining to painted, tinted, stained, enameled, and ornamented earthenware, of which in 1907 there was imported about \$9,000,000 worth, and the importations of that year were about the average for the last six years.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Very expensive articles?

Mr. ALDRICH. Very expensive.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. They are used by the rich?

Mr. ALDRICH. They are used by the rich. The revenue was \$5,420,000 one year; \$5,082,000 in another; \$5,210,000 in another.

Mr. BACON. I want to suggest to the Senator that I recognize that there are various kinds of china and porcelain and earthenware combined in these paragraphs, and that there ought to be a distinction, and some of them ought to bear a higher rate of duty. There is a large class of it, however, that ought to have a low rate of duty, and I ask that these paragraphs may be passed over, that I may offer an amendment which will make the distinction. I have no disposition to ask that upon the higher class of china there should be this low rate of duty, but I think upon the cheaper class there should be a lower rate. I ask that the paragraphs may be passed over.

Mr. LODGE. It is an ad valorem and not a specific rate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia, that the paragraph be passed over?

Mr. LODGE. I object.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Before the vote is taken—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It should be made clear to all that this paragraph provides a duty on an exceedingly expensive class of earthenware, used, of course, by those who can well afford to pay for it.

Mr. BACON. I will withdraw the amendment and offer another. It may accomplish the same purpose. I want to say, however, that in my limited experience in the Senate this is the first time, without exception, I have ever known a case where a Senator rose in his place and said he desired that a

paragraph should be passed over in order that he might perfect an amendment that there was objection made to it by anybody.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator, if he desires to take earthenware out of this paragraph—

Mr. BACON. That is exactly the amendment I was going to offer.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is easy enough for him to accomplish it.

Mr. BACON. I will put it in that way. That is the reason I said I would withdraw the amendment and offer it in another shape.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator wants to do that, he may move to add at the end of the paragraph, "any of the foregoing articles composed of earthenware shall pay a duty of 40 per cent."

Mr. BACON. Thirty-five per cent. I will put it in that shape.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is easy enough.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Senator's amendment is withdrawn, which, of course, vacates the order for the yeas and nays heretofore made. The Secretary will report the next amendment.

Mr. BACON. I do not understand that this has been disposed of.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; I think the Senators had better have an opportunity to vote upon his amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. But the Senator desired to withdraw his amendment.

Mr. BACON. And to offer another.

Mr. ALDRICH. And to offer another.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair misunderstood the Senator. The Senator from Georgia still has the floor.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Georgia desire to offer another amendment? The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. BACON. I offer the amendment to come in at the close of the paragraph. I have proposed to strike out the words "earthen, stone, and crockery ware," so that it would read "china, porcelain, parian, bisque, and earthenware;" but, as suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island, it would possibly be better to put it in the shape of a proviso at the end.

Mr. ALDRICH. "That none of the foregoing articles composed of earthen or stone ware shall pay a duty of more than 35 per cent."

Mr. BACON. Does the term "earthen" include white plates?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; white plates are included in the next paragraph.

Mr. BACON. They would also be included in this paragraph, would they not?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; no white plates at all.

Mr. BACON. Then it is understood that the question of white plates will come up on the next paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. On the next paragraph.

Mr. BACON. All that is necessary is to insert the words which the Senator proposes in the way of a proviso, and I will ask him to repeat them.

Mr. ALDRICH (reading):

Provided, That none of the foregoing articles composed of earthen or stone ware shall pay a higher rate of duty than 35 per cent.

Mr. BACON. I offer that as an amendment, and ask for the yeas and nays upon it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays were ordered on the Senator's previous amendment; and if there be no objection, they will be regarded as ordered on this amendment.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Before the vote is taken, I desire to say a word or two.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator from Iowa let the amendment be reported?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add, at the end of paragraph 91, after the words "ad valorem," the following proviso:

Provided, That none of the foregoing articles, composed entirely of earthen or stone ware, shall pay a higher rate of duty than 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I spoke the other day in an informal way of the earthenware schedule. I stated at the time that, so far as my investigations had enabled me to go, there was no schedule in the tariff law that had more perfectly illustrated the wisdom of the protective doctrine.

I have always felt a special interest in it, because it is one of the few remaining handicrafts of the country and of the

world. From almost the beginning of time it has been the industry of every people attaining even a very moderate civilization. We had a great deal of difficulty to start the earthenware industry in the United States, notwithstanding the evident fact that Providence intended us to make our own dishes and our own earthenware, having put the material as a natural resource under nearly every section of the United States.

I have studied with great care this earthenware schedule, and there are several things about it that differentiate it from many other schedules in the tariff law. One of them is that the rates are ad valorem and not on their face excessive. The other is that in operation they have fully justified the most orthodox definition of the protective-tariff doctrine. Many years ago a great Democratic Secretary of the Treasury defined protection in a way that, it seems to me, has never been improved upon. He said that the rates ought to be high enough to enable the home producer to meet the importer of foreign goods in the American market place on terms of fair competition.

That ideal of protection is very seldom realized in our tariff schedules. If I have seen the correct statistics, it has been almost perfectly realized in the earthenware schedule. There is not an item where the producer is not face to face with an active, vigorous, and sometimes damaging foreign competition.

If you will examine the table of imports you will find that from the common earthenware up to the highest priced china our home manufacturers are every day face to face with a lively competition. We have never even decreased the competition that has come in for nearly a generation from England, although our own people have been able to hold their own against that. The German competition has risen steadily in practically every department of earthenware production, and especially in the higher grades of china, until it is to-day larger than it ever was before, and is productive of one of the most substantial revenues that the Government derives from any source.

Our friends on the Pacific side of the world, with very great skill, starting in with native potteries, illustrating their national art, have accurately copied all the finer wares that are produced in the United States and in Germany and in Austria and France. That kind of importation is rising steadily every year.

For one, I desire to see the earthenware industry not only preserved intact in the United States, but I should like to see it extended to every State in the Union. I find that in my own State, underlying nearly all our coal measures, is a variety of clay corresponding with the finest varieties known anywhere in the United States, and some, we think, as fine as can be found in the world. I know that is true of nearly every Southern State.

I think it is a very modest expectation of the friends of the protective doctrine that we should make our own dishes and the ordinary utensils of the kitchen and of the dining room in the United States, and it is because I believe so radical a reduction in those forms of earthenware that are already pressing our own home production would be damaging to that great industrial interest in the United States that I shall feel constrained to vote against the amendment of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RAYNER. I wish to ask the Senator a question just for information. Does his observation apply to parian and bisque ware as well as to the other?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I am not so much acquainted with the higher grade of goods referred to. They are all on an ad valorem duty, and of course that falls with more weight upon the wares that are of the highest value.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON], upon which the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], who is absent. I will suggest to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] that as he is paired with my colleague [Mr. CLARK] we transfer our pairs, so that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY] will stand paired with my colleague. This arrangement would permit the Senator from Missouri and myself to vote.

Mr. STONE. I have no objection.

Mr. WARREN. Very well. I will make that announcement, and I will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. STONE. I suppose, on account of the transfer, I can vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ELKINS. I am paired with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. If he were present, I would vote "nay."

Mr. CULBERSON. I will state for the day that my colleague [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 25, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—25.

| | | | |
|--------------|----------------|--------------|------------|
| Bacon | Frazier | Newlands | Stone |
| Bankhead | Gore | Overman | Taliaferro |
| Clarke, Ark. | Hughes | Paynter | Taylor |
| Clay | Johnston, Ala. | Rayner | Tillman |
| Culberson | La Follette | Simmons | |
| Fletcher | McLaurin | Smith, Md. | |
| Foster | Martin | Smith, S. C. | |

NAYS—54.

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------|------------------|--------------|
| Aldrich | Chamberlain | Gamble | Perkins |
| Beveridge | Crane | Guggenheim | Piles |
| Borah | Crawford | Hale | Richardson |
| Bradley | Cullom | Heyburn | Root |
| Brandegee | Cummins | Johnson, N. Dak. | Scott |
| Briggs | Curtis | Jones | Smith, Mich. |
| Bristow | Depew | Kean | Smoot |
| Brown | Dick | Lodge | Stephenson |
| Bulkeley | Dillingham | McCumber | Sutherland |
| Burkett | Dixon | Nelson | Warner |
| Burnham | Dolliver | Nixon | Warren |
| Burrows | du Pont | Oliver | Wetmore |
| Burton | Flint | Page | |
| Carter | Gallinger | Penrose | |

NOT VOTING—12.

| | | | |
|--------|-------------|---------|---------|
| Bailey | Clark, Wyo. | Elkins | Money |
| Bourne | Daniel | Frye | Owen |
| Clapp | Davis | McEnery | Shively |

So Mr. BACON's amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will report the next committee amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 22, line 14, in paragraph 91, after the words "or in part" insert "in chief value."

Mr. BACON. I propose to offer an amendment as to the rate in this paragraph, but I do not wish to interfere with the consideration of the amendment.

Mr. ALDRICH. I suggest that the committee amendments might be adopted first, and then the Senator can offer his amendment.

Mr. BACON. Very well.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The next amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 14, after the words "such ware," insert "painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That completes the paragraph as amended. The Senator from Georgia desires to offer an amendment to the paragraph.

Mr. BACON. I offer a proviso to the paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. We are still on paragraph 91.

Mr. BACON. Oh, I beg pardon; I thought it was paragraph 92.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is paragraph 91.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 91 is not yet agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the paragraph as amended is agreed to, and the Secretary will state the first amendment in paragraph 92.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 92, page 22, line 21, after the word "brown," the committee propose to strike out "not subjected to any decorative process, and" and to insert the word "including," so as to read:

92. China, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crockery ware, plain white, plain brown, including clock cases with or without movements.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. After the word "lamps," in line 25, the committee propose to insert the words "all the foregoing."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. In line 25 the committee propose to strike out the word "part" and insert the words "chief value."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. On page 23, line 1, after the words "such ware," insert "not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner."

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, I am going to offer an amendment to the paragraph in the shape of a proviso, which shall limit the rate of duty upon earthen, stone, and crockery ware, plain white or plain brown, not painted, colored, tinted,

stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner, and that the rate shall be 40 per cent.

I want to state that I put the rate at 40 per cent not because I think it ought to be that high, for I think it ought to be 30 per cent, but I am anxious, if possible, to accomplish results and to relieve the burden of this heavy duty upon the class of ware which is most commonly used throughout the whole United States. Therefore I offer the amendment in this shape. I move, at the end of paragraph 92 as it has been amended, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That earthen, stone, and crockery ware, plain white or plain brown, not painted, colored, tinted, stained, enameled, gilded, printed, or ornamented or decorated in any manner, 40 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. ALDRICH. That would be a large increase on a large part of the articles the Senator is mentioning which are fixed by the bill at 25 per cent. He proposes to increase it to 40 per cent.

Mr. BACON. It is not so in this paragraph.

Mr. ALDRICH. In paragraph 90 a large part of the articles the Senator mentions are now dutiable at 25 per cent.

Mr. BACON. I want to change it, of course, so as to cover that. I should like to have the Senator point it out.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator will read paragraph 90 he will find that a large part of this earthenware not ornamented or decorated is dutiable at 25 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. BACON. Then certainly there has been some very unsatisfactory way of classifying it, because the paragraph as I read it, the one which is now under consideration, does include all earthen, stone, and crockery ware, plain white and plain brown, not colored or tinted. I have copied the language of the paragraph. I should like to have the Senator explain to me how there can be a raise when I copied the language of the paragraph in which the duty is put at 55 per cent and I propose to put it at 40 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. I ask the Senator to look on page 23, lines 3 and 4, "not specially provided for in this section." The others are specially provided for in this section, and therefore there is a duty of 25 per cent.

Mr. BACON. But it says "this section."

Mr. ALDRICH. "This section" includes the whole bill, not this paragraph. The section includes the whole bill.

Mr. BACON. I ask the Senator if that does not illustrate the hardship and, I may say, the impropriety in Senators insisting that we shall proceed with the consideration of this paragraph without giving the opportunity to fix an amendment which shall accomplish the purpose I have in view? Everybody knows the purpose I have in view.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator's purpose can be easily accomplished by moving to strike out "fifty-five" and inserting "forty." That covers the whole proposition.

Mr. BACON. No; for the reason that there are certain articles, as I understand it, which are more expensive. If I am wrong about that, then, of course, the suggestion of the Senator is a proper one.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I understand the Senator from Rhode Island to have said a moment ago that if the committee amendment is adopted now and a Senator, after examination, believes that he wants to frame another amendment, the Senator from Rhode Island will agree to a reconsideration. He said a moment ago if any Senator felt that he had not had an opportunity to propose an amendment it could be reconsidered.

Mr. BACON. I understood that to apply to a paragraph we had passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. BACON. Not to this?

Mr. ALDRICH. Not to this.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am glad to know it.

Mr. BACON. I want to ask the Senator from Rhode Island one question, with his permission. The words "china, porcelain, parian," and so forth, relate to a very different class of articles from those which are embraced in the words "earthen, stone, and crockery ware, plain white, plain brown," do they not?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; not necessarily at all.

Mr. BACON. I understand, then, that the words "china, porcelain, parian, and bisque" in that paragraph relate only to the common articles?

Mr. ALDRICH. I take it for granted that the Senator from Georgia would never be able to distinguish between an English earthenware dinner set, for instance, and a French china dinner set. He might in the material, but not in any other way. They are practically indistinguishable to an ordinary man. I suppose an expert could tell the difference between English earthenware and French china at sight, but I assume that no one but an expert could tell the difference. If the Senator

wants to reduce the rate on these articles, the best plan is to try to reduce it on them all.

Mr. BACON. Very well; but I want the Senator to give me information before I make the motion.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am trying the best I can.

Mr. BACON. I know; I am not complaining. I want to find out from the Senator whether I was mistaken in my supposition that the words "china, porcelain, parian, and bisque" in that paragraph relate to a higher class of goods than those which are described by the words "earthen, stone, and crockery ware," or whether they all relate to the same class of goods.

Mr. ALDRICH. They practically all relate to the same class of goods, the plain white goods used by everybody in the United States.

Mr. BACON. I am very much obliged to the Senator for his suggestion, because what I desire is to put a low rate of duty upon that class of goods. The only reason why I made any distinction was that I supposed in this paragraph, as in the preceding one, those words related to an expensive class of goods.

Mr. ALDRICH. They do not.

Mr. BACON. As they do not, I will, after I yield to the Senator from Maryland, offer the amendment suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. RAYNER. I desire to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether he is not entirely mistaken. Is not bisque the very finest quality of French ware, entirely different even from parian and entirely different from the ordinary crockery?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is a very unimportant item. The difference between china and porcelain and earthen and stone ware is entirely immaterial. That is not the class used by all the people of the United States.

Mr. BACON. I am drawing an amendment to follow the explanation made by the Senator from Rhode Island as to the class of goods covered by this paragraph—that is, the common class of crockery used generally throughout the country by people of all classes.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

Mr. BACON. I move to amend by striking out "fifty-five" and inserting "forty" in lieu thereof.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

Mr. BACON. I beg the Chair's pardon, but I repeat that I move the amendment not because I desire as high a rate as 40 per cent, as I would, if I had my way, put it at 30, but I desire to put it at a rate which may be acceptable to those who might be willing to put it at 30.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Why would the Senator put it at 30 rather than 40?

Mr. BACON. Because I wish to make this article of common consumption one which shall be within easy reach of the people who have to use it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Why not make it 15, then?

Mr. BACON. If the Senator from Rhode Island would say that that would be a revenue duty and bring more than 30 per cent, I would be willing to put it at 15. But, Mr. President, I do not understand that that is probably the case. I understand that possibly a rate of 30 per cent would be a better revenue rate than 15. Am I not correct in this, I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think so, unquestionably.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then, why does not the Senator make his amendment "thirty" instead of "forty?"

Mr. BACON. I have offered it at 40 per cent for the reason I have stated. I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether 40 per cent would not be, in his opinion, a revenue rate?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think 30 would be a better revenue rate. I think that would absolutely extinguish the industry in the United States.

Mr. BACON. Very well; then I will offer it at thirty instead of forty. I wish to call attention to the fact that under the present rate there is no revenue to speak of. There are importations amounting to only \$300,000.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; the Senator is mistaken about that. It is about a million dollars.

Mr. BACON. It is on page 11:

Not ornamented or decorated, \$300,265.25 imported.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is mistaken.

Mr. BACON. It is practically a prohibitive duty.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator is mistaken about that. The products of this paragraph are in three or four different items.

Mr. BACON. What does the Senator say?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator will find it in three or four different items. For instance, "plain white, without superadded ornamentation of any kind."

Mr. BACON. The Senator does not state how much.

Mr. ALDRICH. In 1907 there was \$1,000,000 of plain white; in 1908, \$981,000; in 1905, \$1,000,000; and in addition to that there was, under another head, \$300,000 imported. It is about \$1,300,000 worth that was imported in 1907. The revenue is a little over half a million dollars.

Mr. BACON. The Senator is evidently including in that the importations of articles which are included in paragraph 90. What I have before me is the document which the Finance Committee has given us for our guidance.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then the document is wrong.

Mr. BACON. I will read it. It is put down as the information in reference to paragraph 92, the very one which we are now considering, and it says:

Not ornamented or decorated, \$300,265.25.

That is the total of importations, upon which there is a revenue of only \$165,145.89, even at the high rate of duty, which, I say, is practically prohibitory, in view of what must be the immense production in this country of this class of ware. I have looked diligently to try to find in this Statistical Abstract the amount of the product, but I can not find in the index the title either of "crochery" or "earthenware." So I am unable to give the information.

Mr. ALDRICH. I find that the table the Senator refers to is inaccurate in this respect. It is the only inaccuracy I have detected; but in the way in which these tables were prepared, it is not at all strange that there are inaccuracies. It is strange to me that there are not more. I will read the importations for the Senator. I am reading now from the official statement of imports and exports. They show about \$1,300,000 of importations, with a revenue of a little over \$700,000. The Senator can rely upon those figures.

Mr. BACON. The statement I have made is made on the faith of the document the Senator refers to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I simply wish to inquire from what the Senator from Rhode Island is reading?

Mr. ALDRICH. I am reading from the official statement of the Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator from Rhode Island please inform the Senate where that information can be obtained, so that we can have access to it?

Mr. ALDRICH. In the book entitled "Imports and Duties."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. For what year?

Mr. ALDRICH. For a series of years.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What year were the importations which the Senator states were \$700,000, if he will please give the Senate the information?

Mr. ALDRICH. The revenue?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I mean the revenue.

Mr. ALDRICH. 1907.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do.

Mr. ROOT. It is on page 295 of the volume of Imports and Duties.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the book to which I refer.

Mr. ROOT. If the Senator will turn to 1907, he will find the import duties upon plain white china, porcelain, and so forth, the articles included in paragraph 92 of the pending bill, and not including the common yellow or Rockingham ware of paragraph 90. It appears that in 1904 the imports were \$1,186,949 and the duty \$652,822; in 1905 the imports were \$1,058,000 and the duties \$582,000; in 1906 the imports were \$903,000 and the duties \$499,000; in 1907 the imports were \$1,049,000 and the duties were \$577,000.

Mr. BACON. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. ROOT. From page 295 of the volume of Imports and Duties.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then, if the Senator will look at the table numbered 1287, he will find that of other china, porcelain not specially provided for, or ornamented or decorated, there were also importations to the extent of \$300,000 and duties collected to the amount of \$165,000. That is in addition to the other tables.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] to the fact that in 1895 and 1896, when we had a duty of 30 per cent on these articles included in paragraph 192, the revenue was not substantially different from the revenue which is now derived from the present duty of 55 per cent. In 1895 the revenue from these articles, when the rate was 30 per cent, was \$597,126; and in 1896, under the 30 per cent duty, it was \$565,844.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

Mr. ROOT. One moment, until I finish this statement. In the year 1907 the duty was \$577,000.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, the Senator from New York will probably recognize the fact that that peculiar state of affairs, resulting in a corresponding or a similar revenue under a low duty and a high duty, is explained by what is so lucidly set forth in some of the books—I happened to read it yesterday in Tucker's Commentaries on the Constitution—that where a duty is below the best revenue-bearing point, although the importations increase, the decrease of the rate of duty necessarily results in a decrease of the revenue. On the contrary, if you pass the point where there is the best revenue-producing rate, you have a decrease of imports, which, with a corresponding increase of duty, brings in about the same revenue in the one case as in the other. That is the explanation of that.

Mr. ROOT. May I suggest another explanation to the Senator from Georgia; and that is, that in the years 1895 and 1896, under the Wilson tariff act, although the duties on imported merchandise were greatly reduced, so that people could buy this plain china ware at a lower price from abroad, nevertheless the general effect upon the business and prosperity of the country and on the rates of duty included in that act was such that our people had not the money with which to buy china ware from abroad or anywhere else, and, therefore, no greater revenue was produced by the revenue duty of 30 per cent than is produced by the protective duty of 55 per cent.

Mr. BACON. And, Mr. President, I would suggest to the learned and distinguished Senator from New York that, according to the same reasoning, the revenue obtained in 1907 under the paralyzing influence of the Dingley tariff act must have been correspondingly small, although we have no statistics upon that subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON].

Mr. BACON. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CULBERSON. I call the attention of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] to the pamphlet issued by the Finance Committee, entitled "Estimated Revenues," at page 11, where it says:

All other china, porcelain, parian, bisque, earthen, stone, and crochery ware, and manufactures thereof, or of which the same is the component material of chief value, not specially provided for—

The total value of the imports as given there for the year 1907 is \$300,265.25, and the total revenue \$165,145.89. That is, under the present law.

The duty in the pending bill is 55 per cent ad valorem, and it is fixed at the same figure as in the existing law. What I desire to know—and we might as well understand whether these figures are reliable or not—is, does the Senator from Rhode Island suggest that the figures as presented in this Estimate of Revenues are incorrect on this particular item?

Mr. ALDRICH. There is plainly an inaccuracy in that statement, and I am surprised that more have not been discovered. These tables were prepared—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Overnight.

Mr. ALDRICH. They were prepared overnight, almost, and it is not at all strange that there should be some inaccuracies; but the official figures are available to Senators, as stated by the Senator from New York [Mr. ROOT], who has just read from them.

Mr. CULBERSON. Well, Mr. President, I recall that what the Senator from New York read—though I do not recollect all he read—contained a reference to porcelain, china, and so forth, which was painted, ornamented, and decorated, whereas paragraph 92, which we are now considering, and to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] addressed himself, is confined to similar articles not painted or decorated, of which the entire importation was only about \$300,000 and the revenue \$165,000, as I have shown.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas could not have listened either to my statement or to the statement read by the Senator from New York. If he will turn to the volume entitled "Imports and Duties," he will find, in table 1285, that the importations of "plain white, without superadded ornamentation of any kind," amounted to one million five hundred and some odd thousand dollars, and, in table 1287, articles not ornamented or decorated amounted to about \$300,000 more, with a revenue of \$165,000.

Mr. JONES. I would suggest that these same figures are found in this book [exhibiting] on pages 10 and 11. On page 10, under Subdivision L, "plain white, without superadded ornamentation of any kind," \$1,049,000—

Mr. CULBERSON. I had not yielded the floor. I am now on the floor in order to gain some information.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] has read that item, which had escaped my attention.

Mr. LODGE. I called attention to that earlier in the debate. Mr. CULBERSON. I believe I am entitled to the floor, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas is entitled to the floor; and Senators will please address the Chair and get permission to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. CULBERSON. The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] has handed me the volume entitled "Imports and Duties," from 1894 to 1907. On page 296 the figures to which I have referred are verified. In Table No. 1287 I find in 1907 the total imports of "all other china, porcelain," and so forth, "not ornamented or decorated," were \$300,265.25, and the total revenue \$165,145.89, with an ad valorem tariff duty of 55 per cent—the identical figures which are reported by the Senate committee in the pamphlet entitled "Estimated Revenues"—on the articles covered by paragraph 92, to which the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] has proposed his amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. BRISTOW. I want to say, before the vote is taken, that I regret that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] changed his reduction of the duty from 40 per cent to 30 per cent. I should gladly vote for a reduction from 55 per cent to 40 per cent; but I think a reduction from 55 per cent to 30 per cent would be dangerous to some enterprises which have been established.

Mr. BACON. Then, I will, with the permission of the Senate—

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to say—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. BACON] is recognized.

Mr. BACON. I will modify the amendment and make the reduction from 55 to 40 per cent.

Mr. DU PONT. I should like to have the amendment read. I do not exactly understand it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Georgia will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 92, page 23, line 5, it is proposed to strike out "fifty-five" and insert "forty."

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Before the vote is taken, it should be stated of record that it appears that the reduction of this duty would absolutely extinguish the industry, and there has been no contention to the contrary.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ELKINS (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY]. If he were present and voting, I should vote "nay."

Mr. STONE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK]. I transfer the pair to the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. MONEY], who is paired with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN]. This will leave the senior Senator from Wyoming and myself at liberty to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. WARREN (when his name was called). Under the transfer of pairs just announced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE], I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BACON. I desire to state that my colleague [Mr. CLAY] is necessarily absent from the Chamber at this time. He has a general pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I think they are both absent. I will inquire if the senior Senator from Massachusetts has voted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts has voted, the Chair is informed.

Mr. BACON. I wanted to call his attention to the fact that my colleague has not voted, and I know they have a general pair.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the senior Senator from Massachusetts has not voted.

Mr. BACON. That is the very question I asked, and I understood the Chair to say that he had voted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the senior Senator from Massachusetts has voted.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then I will take the liberty of withdrawing his vote for him.

Mr. BACON. I am sure if the Senator from Massachusetts were present he would do so.

Mr. ALDRICH. Perhaps I had better withdraw my own vote, and stand paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY].

Mr. BACON. Very well.

Mr. ALDRICH (after having voted in the negative). I ask to do that; and will therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. McLAURIN. My colleague [Mr. MONEY] is paired with the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], who, I believe, has transferred the pair to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CLARK].

The result was announced—yeas 27, nays 50, as follows:

YEAS—27.

| | | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------|--------------|
| Bacon | Fletcher | McLaurin | Smith, Md. |
| Bankhead | Foster | Martin | Smith, S. C. |
| Bristow | Frazier | Newlands | Stone |
| Chamberlain | Gore | Overman | Taliaferro |
| Clarke, Ark. | Hughes | Payner | Taylor |
| Crawford | Johnston, Ala. | Rayner | Tillman |
| Culbertson | La Follette | Simmons | |

NAYS—50.

| | | | |
|-----------|------------|------------------|--------------|
| Beveridge | Cullom | Hale | Piles |
| Borah | Cummins | Heyburn | Richardson |
| Bradley | Curtis | Johnson, N. Dak. | Root |
| Brandegee | Deputy | Jones | Scott |
| Briggs | Dick | Kean | Smith, Mich. |
| Brown | Dillingham | Lodge | Smoot |
| Bulkeley | Dixon | McCumber | Stephenson |
| Burkett | Dolliver | Nelson | Sutherland |
| Burnham | du Pont | Nixon | Warner |
| Burrows | Flint | Oliver | Warren |
| Burton | Gallinger | Page | Wetmore |
| Carter | Gamble | Penrose | |
| Crane | Guggenheim | Perkins | |

NOT VOTING—14.

| | | | |
|---------|-------------|---------|---------|
| Aldrich | Clark, Wyo. | Elkins | Owen |
| Bailey | Clay | Frye | Shively |
| Bourne | Daniel | McEnery | |
| Clapp | Davis | Money | |

So Mr. BACON's amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is now upon agreeing to the paragraph as amended.

The paragraph as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the next paragraph which was passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is paragraph 94—gas retorts.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I will ask that that paragraph be passed over. The junior Senator from Texas [Mr. BAILEY] desires to be present when it is considered. He spoke to me about it. So I ask that it be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the paragraph being passed over?

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee have an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, before passing over the paragraph, I desire to offer an amendment, not in relation to gas retorts, but relating to electric carbons. I send the amendment to the desk.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I hope the amendment will be offered and printed in the Record, so that it may be examined.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Let the amendment be stated.

Mr. OVERMAN. Yes; let the amendment be read.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas, for whom the Senator from Wisconsin speaks, is absent and is a member of the committee. If he desires to have anything go over—

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understand that he is a member of the committee; but he spoke to me about this paragraph just before going away. I am interested in it also, and would like to have it passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Utah will be read.

Mr. SMOOT. The amendment should come in after the words "ad valorem," in line 14, on page 23, relating to electric carbons.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated. The SECRETARY. On page 23, line 14, after the words "ad valorem" and the semicolon at that place, it is proposed to insert:

Carbons for electric lighting made entirely from petroleum coke, 35 cents per hundred feet; if composed chiefly of lampblack or retort carbon, 65 cents per hundred feet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. SMOOT. If there is no objection, could we not adopt the amendment at this time?

Mr. OVERMAN. No; I should like to examine it before it is adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next paragraph passed over will be stated.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At this point, may I ask the Senator from Utah whether the amendment he has offered is a reduction?

Mr. SMOOT. It is a great reduction over the House report and also the report that we have already made.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I am very glad to hear that. I think that we are getting so that we can make progress.

Mr. OVERMAN. I will ask the Senator from Utah if the amendment as reported by the committee, which purports to be a reduction, is not really a 40 per cent increase?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not quite understand the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. I asked the Senator if the amendment that is reported by the committee, which purports to be a reduction, is not really an increase of 40 per cent.

Mr. SMOOT. It certainly is not. The amendment I have just submitted on all low-price carbon reduces the duty from 90 cents to 35 cents a hundred feet, and on the higher grade carbon it reduces the duty from 90 cents to 65 cents per hundred feet.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is under the amendment?

Mr. SMOOT. That is under the amendment I have offered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Paragraph 94 will be passed over. The Secretary will read the next paragraph passed over.

The SECRETARY. The next paragraph passed over is at the top of page 25, paragraph 96. The committee propose to strike out all of the paragraph as printed in the House bill.

Mr. ALDRICH. Was paragraph 95 agreed to?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that paragraph 95 was heretofore agreed to.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Nothing has been done with it now.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee have an amendment to offer to paragraph 95. I move to strike out the proviso, beginning in line 23, on page 24, and transfer it to the next paragraph. It was misplaced in the print of the bill. The proviso reads:

And provided further, That, for the purposes of this act, bottles with cut-glass stoppers shall, with the stoppers, be deemed entreties.

I move to insert that proviso after the words "ad valorem," in line 24, page 25.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The committee proposes to strike out all of paragraph 96 as printed in the House bill, and to insert a new paragraph 96, as follows:

96. Glass bottles, decanters, and all articles of every description composed wholly or in chief value of glass, ornamented or decorated in any manner, or cut, engraved, painted, decorated, ornamented, colored, stained, silvered, gilded, etched, sand blasted, frosted, or printed in any manner, or ground (except such grinding as is necessary for fitting stoppers or for purposes other than ornamentation), and all articles of every description, including bottles and bottle glassware, composed wholly or in chief value of glass blown either in a mold or otherwise; all of the foregoing, filled or unfilled, and whether their contents be dutiable or free, 60 per cent ad valorem: *Provided*, That, for the purposes of this act, bottles with cut-glass stoppers shall, with the stoppers, be deemed entreties.

Mr. ALDRICH. In line 22, after the word "foregoing," the words "not specially provided for in this section" should be inserted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. Paragraph 96, page 25, line 22, after the word "foregoing," it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by inserting "not specially provided for in this section."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The substitute paragraph, I see, makes no change in the duty, and I assume that this amendment is purely a reclassification and a better classification than that proposed by the House?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Rhode Island whether it has been impossible to secure the statistics as to the value of the products under the glass schedule, beginning with paragraph No. 95? In looking over this schedule which has been prepared by the committee, I find a blank space under the head of value of products opposite the most of these items. I regard that information as of great value, because it is only by a comparison of the imports of a particular commodity with the actual production in this country that we are able to determine whether or not a rate of duty is unduly prohibitory of importations or unduly promotive of trusts and combinations inside the tariff wall.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, the statistics to which the Senator refers were prepared by the Census Office and not by the committee. But they were the best statistics we had upon

the subject. The entire production of glass, window glass, all kinds of glass, mostly window glass, in the United States was about \$32,000,000 in value. As classified in the book I have it is \$21,000,000 of building glass, whatever that may be, and \$11,000,000 of window glass.

Mr. NEWLANDS. That is the total production of the country?

Mr. ALDRICH. That is the total production of the country. Mr. NEWLANDS. About \$32,000,000. Has the Senator the total value of the imports of glass?

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, yes. They are, of course, under different provisions of the statistical statement. About what particular kind of glass does the Senator want information?

Mr. NEWLANDS. I did not wish them by items. The Senator made a general statement of the total production of the country, and I wish to compare the total production with the total importations.

Mr. ALDRICH. That is a matter of mathematical computation. We can take these items and add them up. I will do that later on, if the Senator desires it.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I thought perhaps the Senator had it in convenient form.

Now, as to these schedules, I observe that the duties range all the way from 40 to 60 per cent.

Mr. ALDRICH. All the duties upon this particular item now under consideration are 60 per cent. There is no change in them. They are all 60 per cent.

Mr. NEWLANDS. What is that—item 96?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes; 96. That is the one now under consideration.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Those are 60 per cent?

Mr. ALDRICH. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest that paragraph 96 has been agreed to. It is the next paragraph—

Mr. ALDRICH. I beg pardon of the Chair.

Mr. STONE. Paragraph 95 has not been agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 95 has been agreed to.

Mr. STONE. Paragraph 95 is the very paragraph we have been considering.

Mr. ALDRICH. Paragraph 95 has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Both paragraphs 95 and 96 have been agreed to.

Mr. ALDRICH. If the Senator has an amendment to offer, I will—

Mr. STONE. I wish to make an inquiry, possibly from the Senator from Utah, who engaged in a short colloquy with me about it the other day.

I have in my hand a letter from a large establishment in St. Louis engaged, among other things, in the manufacture of bottles. The president of that company writes me that during the last year there were 41,000,000 bottles imported, filled with malt liquors, mineral waters, champagne, and still wines, upon which he says no duty was paid, and that after being emptied they entered largely into use in this country. It is a very large free importation, and he asked me to call the attention of the committee of the Senate to it, and to inquire whether the expression in paragraph 303 and the following paragraph relates to still wines, ale, and so forth: "But no separate or additional duty shall be levied on the bottles."

Mr. ALDRICH. That is plain.

Mr. STONE. Perfectly plain.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not changed by the Senate provision or by the House provision. Does the Senator desire a duty upon beer bottles?

Mr. STONE. I am asking for information whether it is a fact that forty-odd million bottles filled with these contents came in free?

Mr. ALDRICH. They do. They do not pay any separate duty.

Mr. STONE. Are they calculated—

Mr. SMOOT. They do not pay any specific duty on the bottle, but on mineral water they pay on the case. In other words, taking a case of mineral water containing a hundred pint bottles, it pays \$1.66 a case. That is not upon the water; but there is \$1.66 upon the case.

Mr. ALDRICH. But the Senator asked especially about bottles in the spirit schedule.

Mr. STONE. Yes.

Mr. ALDRICH. And there is no duty, and there never has been, on the bottle separately.

Mr. STONE. Is the value of the bottle estimated in fixing the duty on the contents?

Mr. ALDRICH. No; the duties are all specific, and there are no extra duties. You asked whether the bottle was taken into consideration. That is a question which anybody can de-

termine for himself. But there is no separate duty upon bottles.

Mr. SMOOT. I am fully aware of what the bottle manufacturers want in this particular, and they suggested that an amendment be made to paragraph 95, requiring that there be blown into the bottle the name of the contents, the name of the manufacturer, and the country where made. But the Committee on Finance has not yet agreed to that provision. As it is now, those bottles do not directly pay a duty; but, as I was saying to the Senator, if you take, for instance, the duty on mineral water, they pay it indirectly at least, because every case of pints coming into this country pays a duty of \$1.66. The House did provide, in paragraph 309 of the bill, touching mineral waters, that there should be an additional duty of 90 cents a case for the bottles. The committee could not agree to that provision and took it out of the bill and allowed the Dingley Act to remain as it is, carrying a duty upon the case of pints of \$1.66.

Mr. STONE. I should like for the Senator, if he can speak for the committee, to state whether there ought not to be some separate duty imposed upon the bottles?

Mr. SMOOT. The way the glass manufacturers want us to arrive at that is this—

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from Missouri is not speaking for the glass manufacturers. He is speaking for the brewers, as I understood him. He said—

Mr. STONE. I am not speaking for the brewers. I did not mention the brewers.

Mr. ALDRICH. I thought the Senator said his correspondent was a brewer.

Mr. STONE. My correspondent is the Obeas-Nestor Glass Company, manufacturers of glass bottles, among other things.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I understood.

Mr. ALDRICH. The brewers are the people who have protested to me.

Mr. STONE. They have not to me.

Mr. ALDRICH. They have to me. But this manufacturer protests that there ought to be a separate duty levied upon the imported bottles carrying wine or water.

Mr. SMOOT. It is true that these bottles imported here, such as mineral-water bottles, are purchased again and refilled, and the American manufacturer does not want the mineral-water bottles of Germany imported here filled with water and then as soon as emptied sold again to be refilled with something else. That is the contention of the glass manufacturers.

Mr. STONE. That is the contention exactly. Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say to the Senator here that I am rather inclined to think it should be required that the names be blown upon the bottle, but I have not as yet come to the definite conclusion whether that ought to be put in this bill or not. The committee has not yet decided that.

Mr. FLINT. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that the committee has not yet disposed of the matter.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator from Utah agree or disagree in the wish of the bottle manufacturers, that a duty should be placed upon the bottles?

Mr. SMOOT. I disagree to that—that there should be a duty put upon the bottles—but I have not yet decided whether it would not be best to have the name blown on the bottles.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator from Missouri give us his judgment?

Mr. STONE. I think there ought to be.

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator can get at that easily by making a motion to take these articles from the free list and make them dutiable.

Mr. STONE. I suppose probably the time to make a motion of that kind would be when we reach the later provision. But my purpose at this time was to ask whether the committee itself had considered the question.

Mr. ALDRICH. The committee has considered it at great length, and is unanimously of the opinion that these articles ought not to be taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, I observe that the duties collected from china ware aggregate about \$7,000,000, and that the duties on glassware do not amount to nearly that sum, although I have not been able to compute it, because there are so many items. I will ask the Senator from Rhode Island which of these industries is in the more prosperous condition in this country—the china ware or the glassware—as shown by the domestic production and as compared with importations?

Mr. ALDRICH. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Scott] can answer the question better than I can.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator from Nevada and the Senate will have patience with me for a few minutes, I think I can show to the Senate, and possibly to the country, the greatest object lesson in the policy of protection of any that has been or possibly will be cited upon this floor. But I do not know whether the Senator wants me to go into that subject or not.

Mr. NEWLANDS. All I asked was as to the relative condition of these two industries. I observe, for instance, that on china ware, common china ware—earthenware—the duty is comparatively low, and upon the articles of luxury it ranges from 50 to 60 per cent; and I also observe that glassware is not put down as an article of luxury, and there the duty seems to range as high as 69 per cent in some instances.

Mr. SCOTT. If the Senator will allow me, if he will refer to the hearings on "Schedule B" from pages 949 to 960, he will probably get the information he wants in regard to the china proposition; and I can say personally with regard to the glass business that it has been fairly remunerative in the last few years—nothing more than a man should have upon his investment when he takes the risk of going into manufacturing in place of loaning his money upon first mortgages. But there has been no great money made in it at all, and we are now progressing in a way. The home competition, in addition to foreign competition, holds us down to a very close margin, and we are very well satisfied if we can make 7 to 8 per cent upon our investment. Sometimes, if we are very fortunate, we possibly can reach a 10 per cent dividend during the year, but more often we are compelled to be contented with 6 or 7 per cent.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Have any of the duties on glassware been increased in the Senate bill?

Mr. SCOTT. Not in the line in which I am interested, and that I know of, particularly.

Mr. NEWLANDS. How is it with china ware? Have any of the duties been increased?

Mr. SCOTT. I think not.

Mr. ALDRICH. The duties upon china are maintained at the Dingley rate. The duties upon glass, with few exceptions, have been reduced. I will say that I think in a majority of cases the Dingley rates are maintained. In a few instances certain glass was lowered, and in two instances, plate glass, the rates were raised above the Dingley rate.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The plate-glass industry is a very important one. The production of plate glass is very large, I believe.

Mr. ALDRICH. Both; all kinds of glass.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to ask the Senator whether he made any inquiry into these two schedules with a view to determining whether or not the high duties hitherto imposed, in excess of 50 per cent, we will say, ought to be maintained, in view of the fact that those industries are no longer infant industries, but seem to be thoroughly well established?

Mr. ALDRICH. I think the average duties in the glass schedule are over 50 per cent; I think some of them are greatly above 50 per cent; but if any article manufactured in the United States needs protection and should have it it is glass. It is almost entirely a question of labor. They take the crude materials from the earth and expend a great deal of time and labor upon them up to the finished product; and the present rates of duty have been but fairly protective. The importations are very large of all descriptions of glass and always have been. I think we are gaining a little upon the foreign production, but very little, and this industry is one of the industries which deserves our care and should have it to the extent of the protection it needs.

Mr. HALE. The competition is intense.

Mr. ALDRICH. The competition is intense, in Belgium and in every other part of the world.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I have observed that in the framing of this bill the committee have put low duties upon the necessities and much higher duties upon so-called "luxuries." Almost all these articles under the glass schedule are ranked as necessities. I wondered why it was that the excessive duties which, as a rule, pertain only to luxuries in these schedules, were retained as against that class of products.

Mr. ALDRICH. It was the intention of the committee in every schedule and in every paragraph to make higher rates of duty upon articles of luxury and to make lower rates of duties, as low as consistent with the system of protection, upon the lower class of articles.

Mr. NEWLANDS. And the Senator is of the opinion that no lower duty than 50 per cent can be imposed upon glassware?

Mr. ALDRICH. My own feeling is that the rates proposed in this bill are fair and proper, and perhaps generous to the glass manufacturers.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I dislike to delay the Senate, but I made a statement a week or ten days ago, in which I said that before there was any duty on glassware, pitchers cost anywhere from three to four dollars, and that now they could be bought for \$1.25 a dozen. Here [exhibiting] is a pitcher, a half-gallon pitcher, which can be bought at the factory for 90 cents a dozen—not apiece, but a dozen. I want to say furthermore, when I was first in the glass business, before there was a duty, a tumbler like this [exhibiting] we sold readily for \$2.50 a dozen. Now it is selling for 11 cents a dozen—less than 1 cent apiece—all owing to the protection that the Republican party has given us on glassware.

There [exhibiting] is a dish that you can buy in any store for 10 cents. It sells for 70 cents a dozen. If we keep on at the rate we are going with glassware and if you will continue to give us this protection, I have not much doubt that in a few years we will be paying the consumer something to carry this glassware home.

There [exhibiting] is a goblet which sold for from \$2.50 to \$3 a dozen when we had no protection. Now it is selling for 25 cents a dozen to the wholesaler.

The trouble is not with the manufacturers. In a great many instances of these goods the trouble is with the retailer and with the jobber. I have here a picture of an 11-story building in the city of New York, owned by a man who twenty-eight years ago had limited credit. He was on the third story on a side street in New York, and in twenty-eight years he has made enough money to build that 11-story building, covering over 300,000 square feet. He has made more money, if he owns that building in fee simple, in twenty-eight years than all the glass manufacturers in the United States in the same length of time, for in the last nine years 59 per cent of the flint-glass factories have failed.

He is a retailer of glass and a wholesaler of glass, and he advertises very largely in Canada. This [exhibiting] is a sheet from a Canadian trade journal advertising his wares in Canada.

The duty that you are giving us to-day in paragraph 96 is the same that we have had. This reduction in price has been brought about by improved machinery and improved conditions, by all of us working together, taking out patents, doing all we can to reduce the cost to the consumer, and to keep the man and his family at work in the factory. It is not like the case referred to by my friend the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKETT] the other day. When duties were not high enough to keep the factories going, from 1891 to 1896, two young men went out to Iowa on a farm adjoining his father's, and they became farmers, raising corn and wheat in competition with the Senator from Nebraska and his father.

It took them away from the class of consumers. When they were consumers, they were buying what the Senator from Nebraska and his father raised. But owing to the depression, they were sent away from the factory, because we shut down, and they went out on the prairie and broke up the prairie land and became producers, and came in competition with the men who had been supplying them as consumers.

All we ask—and we have got it, and I thank the Senate for it—is to give us this duty, and we will reduce the cost to the consumer if there is any way to control the two middlemen.

Mr. JONES. I should like to ask the Senator a question. It has been stated on this side of the Chamber time and again in this debate that the tariff is practically all added to the cost and that the consumer has to pay that in addition to the cost of manufacturing. I am very much interested in the example the Senator has put out here, and I wonder if the manufacturer has not been selling those articles at less than the duty itself.

Mr. SCOTT. The selling price almost corresponds to the ad valorem duty.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I suggest that then there is hardly any need of a duty. But I wish to make an inquiry. The Senator made a reference to middlemen and to retailers which is very interesting. I understood him to say the trouble was not with the manufacturer, but with the retailers. Now, take the pitcher which he has just instanced and which is produced at a very low cost. I forget the price, but the Senator can state it.

Mr. SCOTT. Ninety cents a dozen.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Ninety cents a dozen?

Mr. SCOTT. And the labor on that article is from 85 to 90 per cent.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Let me ask the Senator, now, at what price does the retailer sell that pitcher?

Mr. SCOTT. I can not answer the Senator on that point. I could possibly go down the street and ascertain. But I presume

the consumer would have to pay from 40 to 50 cents for the pitcher.

Mr. NEWLANDS. For each pitcher? That would be \$4.80 a dozen.

Mr. SCOTT. In all probability, because the retailer buys it from the jobber. The prices I am quoting here are the prices from the manufacturer to the wholesale dealer.

Mr. NEWLANDS. To the wholesaler?

Mr. SCOTT. Then the wholesaler sells it to the retailer, and he in turn sells it to the consumer.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator gives the price of the manufacturer as 90 cents a dozen, and the price of the retailer as \$4.80 a dozen.

Mr. SCOTT. Not positively. He must not quote me positively. If I should make inquiry on Pennsylvania avenue, I should probably find the exact price.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Approximately.

Mr. SCOTT. Approximately.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I understood the Senator to say it would be \$4.80 a dozen.

Mr. SCOTT. Forty to 50 cents apiece.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Can the Senator give us the price of the jobber?

Mr. SCOTT. No; I can not. The jobber, counting his expenses, would add 10 or 15 per cent or more. There is probably 8 to 10 per cent in breakage in shipping the goods. That would have to be taken into consideration.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from Nevada wants a concrete case of even greater discrepancy than that, I can give it to him, and not only one instance, but a great many, as to the profits made by the retailer.

Mr. NEWLANDS. What struck me was the discrepancy in price between that at which the jobber bought and the price charged by the retailer to the consumer. It seems to me that if the difference is so enormous, it is about time we were looking into the action of the retailers, unless it can be accounted for in some rational way.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator from Nevada before he sits down what he proposes as a remedy by action of Congress for this remarkable disproportion between the prices of the manufacturers, with which we deal in a tariff bill, and the prices that are afforded to the consumer by the jobber and at last by the retailer? One of the things that Congress is finding out—and in the end the people, the consumers, will find out—is that the burden of prices paid by them at their houses, in their families, for consumption have little relation to the system, which some of us mean to maintain, of protection to the manufacturer. The immediate result of the protective theory as applied to legislation is the protection to the manufacturer in competition with foreign manufacturers. There is no schedule that shows this condition in so marked a degree, I think, as the glass schedule. Under it we manufacture by American labor, as American products, all the articles furnished to the people, which is illustrated by what the Senator from West Virginia has shown here.

When Congress has done that and has reared in different parts of the country this manufacture and sustained it against foreign competition it has very little to do, and this Congress is finding out—I know that I am—as never before, that the prices which are paid by the consumer at his door, at his home, have very little to do with the rates that we establish. I do not know, and I can not by any process of which I am capable reach how much that little is.

The Senator has said that Congress ought in some way to deal with this question of the amazing advance of prices, not with the manufacturer whom we sustain, but the middlemen, the jobber, the retailer. Does the Senator believe that Congress can take that matter in charge and can prescribe rates at which articles shall be sold in the wholesale market by the jobber, and in the retail market by the retailer? Where is the remedy that the Senator would suggest? It is one of the points of enlightenment that is coming from this Congress that people will understand that, while the great system of protection will build up these manufactures and protect us from inundation by foreign labor, it has very little to do with the prices that are paid by the consumer at his fireside.

Mr. NEWLANDS and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to both Senators.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I wish to answer the question put by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Nevada allow me?

Mr. NEWLANDS. In just one moment. Please let me answer.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator can answer this at the same time—

Mr. NEWLANDS. I beg pardon; I wish to answer the question put to me by the Senator from Maine. I will yield to the Senator later.

Mr. SCOTT. I believe I have the floor. I will yield to the Senator from Nevada first and then I will yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wanted to give a concrete case.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President, the Senator from Maine has asked me a very difficult question, one which I am unprepared to answer at this moment. He asks me how I would have Congress deal with the apparently extortionate prices that are charged not by the manufacturers but by the retailers to the consumer.

Mr. HALE. And by the jobbers.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am not prepared to answer that question. I am not prepared to say that Congress has any power to deal with that question. It may be a matter of such purely domestic commerce as to be entirely without the domain of congressional action, and it may be at all times unwise to enter upon any attempt to regulate the prices even in domestic commerce, though it has been attempted in the legislation of civilized peoples before.

But I do think Congress can go this far. It can furnish the machinery by which the country will be informed as to the difference between the cost of production by the manufacturer here and the cost of production by the manufacturer abroad, and the difference between the price charged by the manufacturer here and the price charged by the manufacturer abroad. It can also, through some board or commission or by charging the Executive with the duty, enter into an inquiry as to the respective prices that are charged by the manufacturer to the jobber, and by the jobber to the retailer, and by the retailer to the consumer, with a view to fixing the responsibility for the high prices which now prevail. If these high prices are due to the extortion of the manufacturer—

Mr. SCOTT. Will not the Senator let me finish? I will yield the floor to him in a few minutes. I thought the Senator wanted to ask a question.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am answering the Senator from Maine. Of course I do not wish to interfere with the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. Go ahead.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I was remarking that Congress can organize some kind of a tribunal that will make the inquiry and fix the responsibility for high prices either upon the manufacturer, the jobber, or the retailer, or apportion it between them. We who are interested in the revision and the reduction of the tariff wish to know whether these high prices are chargeable to the manufacturer and to the fact that he is protected against foreign competition by a high-tariff law. If that is not the case, we want to know it. We wish to know whether the fault is the fault of the jobber; we wish to know if the fault is the fault of the retailer; we wish to fix the responsibility for the high prices that prevail in this country, which, admittedly, are above the general level of the world's prices in most articles.

We will assume, then, that a commission is organized for that purpose—a commission having jurisdiction of foreign commerce, we will say, just as we now have one of interstate commerce, a branch of the same commission, one engaged in interstate commerce and the other engaged in an inquiry of foreign commerce. What would be the result? We would accumulate within five or ten years a mass of statistics, arranged in tabulated form, just as the transportation statistics have been presented, and then the country would have the information upon which to proceed. Public opinion would be instructed as to the source of these high prices and public sentiment would be instructed as to the method of meeting that difficulty.

I am very glad that I made this inquiry of the Senator from West Virginia. It is a revelation to me that a pitcher which he exhibits can be purchased for 70 cents a dozen. I would not have thought it possible—

Mr. SCOTT. Ninety cents.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I would not have thought it possible that the retailer can take a dozen of those pitchers, costing only 90 cents originally, and retail them for \$4.80 a dozen. It is a revelation to me. We will assume, however, that these two facts exist at the same time. The inquiry would still remain as to whether a high tariff does not protect the retailer in this

act of extortion. That would be one inquiry. It seems to me that we ought to have some organized body or some individual whose special duty it would be to arrange in tables under the various schedules of this bill, covering about 400 items, and in tabulated form, year after year, statistics regarding these matters, so that public opinion can be instructed in this country and so that we can then frame legislation that will meet these difficulties.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator—

Mr. SCOTT. I am afraid my speech—

Mr. NEWLANDS. I am through.

Mr. SCOTT. I am afraid my speech will be smothered under the very eloquent remarks of the Senator from Nevada and my other friends. I will yield to the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT], if the Senator will allow me.

Mr. HALE. Just one moment.

Mr. SCOTT. The Senator from California will yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FLINT. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada whether he or whether the wit of man can devise a better system or operation of a tariff schedule than that which produces as its result the illustration afforded by the Senator from West Virginia? A dozen pitchers of the kind which he presents here under this system of tariff protection are brought out and put upon the market at the rate of 90 cents a dozen.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Does the Senator put an inquiry to me regarding that?

Mr. HALE. Can he or can anybody devise a better system that operates better than what the Senator from West Virginia has shown here, when a dozen pitchers of that kind, however much the price may be enhanced to the consumer, are produced and sent out by dozens and thousands, it may be tens of thousands, to market at 90 cents per dozen? I can not conceive any system or any plan of a tariff that can produce anything more beneficial to the people than what the Senator has shown in his illustration.

Mr. SCOTT. I will yield to the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT].

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, I am very glad the Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] recognizes the truth of the claim of the Republicans that the rate of duty paid under this tariff bill is not a material factor in the cost to the consumer of these articles. I desire to call his attention to one or two illustrations. I have a great many of them, and this is a very good time to put in one or two.

I call his attention to the cost of a 100-piece dinner set of Haviland & Co.'s make. It was invoiced to their New York house at \$5.77; packing charges, 46 cents; customs-house advance to make value, 58 cents; total \$6.81. The duty at 60 per cent is \$4.08, making a total cost of \$10.89. That set of Haviland china is selling in the city of Washington for \$36. There is a profit of about \$26 on those articles.

I call the attention of Senators to these articles to ascertain whether they think that a duty of \$4.08 on these articles is a factor in the price that is charged the consumer. There is \$25 profit difference in the price of that article over the price or cost to land in this country.

I call the attention of Senators to a number of other small articles. I take Japanese china ware. Blueprint cups and saucers pay a duty on a valuation of 3½ cents per pair, including packing charges, paying a duty of 60 per cent or 2½ cents per pair. These goods sell in Washington at 35 cents a pair, or almost 1,000 per cent over the value at which they pay duty. The consumer pays 2½ cents duty on a 35-cent purchase, or 6½ per cent.

The same proportion holds good on the following items: Plates, dutiable price, 3½ cents; retail price, 35 cents each. Egg cups, dutiable price, 1½ cents, sell for 15 cents each. A tea set, composed of teapot, sugar, cream, and six cups and saucers, cost 41 cents, with duty paid, and is selling in the stores in Washington for \$3.50. An article costing 41 cents is selling at retail for \$3.50, and these are the prices charged by the large department stores throughout the country. When you come to small places in Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, and the Dakotas, the prices are from 20 to 30 per cent in addition to that.

Mr. HALE. And 50 per cent sometimes.

Mr. FLINT. And 50 per cent, as the Senator from Maine says.

I say, and I repeat, there is not an article in this china schedule where the duty is a factor in fixing the selling price to the consumer. If the Senator from Nevada, as suggested by the Senator from Maine, can find some way by which we can control the selling price of these articles after they leave the manufacturer, then there may be some solution of the prob-

lem; but we find the manufacturer making but a fair and honest profit under the protective-tariff system, and yet the consumer is complaining of excessive charges, not by reason of the profit made by the manufacturer, but by reason of the excessive prices charged by the jobbing houses and the retail stores.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. NEWLANDS addressed the Chair.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield now to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I also call the attention of the Senator from Nevada to the fact that it does not only apply to the glass and china schedule; it applies to almost every schedule that there is in this bill.

For instance, take the manufacture of razors. I have an invoice in my office now where the manufacturer charges \$3.95 a dozen for razors. The jobber in St. Louis secures a 2 per cent discount for cash in ten days upon that article. He jobs the article that costs him \$3.95, with 2 per cent discount in ten days, for \$9 a dozen. That is the transaction between the jobber and the retailer. The retailer sells every one of those razors for \$2 apiece. In other words, the manufacturer in Connecticut sells one dozen of those razors for \$3.95, less 2 per cent for cash in ten days, and the consumer pays \$2 apiece for them, or \$24 a dozen.

Again, there is a great deal said in this country in relation to gloves. I can walk down here to any store in Washington and go in and ask the retail price of a pair of gloves, and for a glove that costs \$7.40 a dozen the ladies of this country are paying \$2 a pair.

So, Mr. President, it does not apply only to the china schedule or the glass schedule. The country, it seems to me, ought to be made to understand that this is not due to the manufacturer.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

Mr. SCOTT. I will be through in a minute, if Senators will allow me. I wish to correct one statement that might be misleading. I was asked the question if the duty was not more than the article. Of course that could not be, because it is *ad valorem*. I want to correct that.

Now, Mr. President, I hold in my hand here a tumbler [exhibiting]. It is finished as you see it there. A dealer wants a tumbler of a certain pattern. We call that the diamond-and-fan pattern.

The first process is to mark off just as many of these squares as will go around that diameter. Then the next process is roughing it, as Senators can see who will come close to it. It is that process there [indicating]. The next process is where it is put on another wheel, a crag-leaf stone, which leaves it blind; in other words, it is not bright. That is imported as cheap common glass from Europe, and comes into this country against our high-price glass cutters, because the glass cutter earns anywhere from \$3.50 to \$5.50 a day. All the importer has to do is to put that on a brush wheel with glass cutter's putty on it and polish it and make it a finished cut article. Consequently he evades the duty on the article and brings in an article that costs him in labor in Europe probably not more than a dollar or a dollar and a quarter for ten or twelve hours work, when we pay anywhere, as I said, from \$3.50 to \$5.50 a day.

These undervaluations are a great hardship both to the glass manufacturers and glass cutters of this country and to the earthenware and pottery and china people.

Now, Mr. President, I have to apologize to the Senate for detaining it so long.

Mr. BURKETT. Let me ask the Senator a question. Is there not a differential between glass in blank and the finished product and between the different steps to the finished product?

Mr. SCOTT. It is the difference between 40 and 60.

Mr. BURKETT. Then the statement would not be exactly true that the article was brought in in a mostly finished shape as a cheaper article.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; it is a different glass, that is brought in at a lower rate of duty.

Mr. BURKETT. I understand that, but that is what the differential is for.

Mr. SCOTT. Certainly; that is what the differential is for.

Mr. FLETCHER. I desire to ask the Senator from West Virginia and also the Senator from Utah whether the great disparity in prices between the manufacturer's price and the retail merchant's price to the consumer is not due in a large measure to two causes; first, that the manufacturer will not sell the manufactured article to the jobber until the jobber agrees with the manufacturer that he will not sell it under a given price to the retailer; and, second, that the retailer must agree with the jobber, before the jobber will let him have the goods, that he shall demand a certain price from the consumer. Is not that the situation?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir; not at all. I will say to the Senator I have been forty years in the manufacture of glass, and I never in my life knew of any such contract or agreement—absolutely none.

Mr. FLETCHER. It may be possible, as the Senator from West Virginia states, but it seems to me that is the only way to account for the enormous profit which the retailer must make under the conditions which have been shown here to-day, because we know, as a matter of common knowledge, that there is competition among the retail merchants in every community, in every city, town, and village in the country, and it does not stand to reason that one retailer will permit another retailer in close competition with him to make three and four dollars profit on a dozen pitchers, when he could get enormously rich at a profit much less than that.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I was glad to hear the Senator from West Virginia correct his assent to the proposition that had been made by the junior Senator from Washington, that the Senator from West Virginia did sell at less than the duty, because, until the Senator from West Virginia corrected the assent he had given to the statement of the Senator from Washington, I was very much troubled to know how it could be necessary to have any protective duty for glass if the factories were selling glass at less than 60 per cent of the price at which the foreign manufacturer could land it in this country.

I am not troubled about any legislation on the question as to how it comes about that the price the jobbers and the retail merchants sell their goods is so much greater than that which they pay the manufacturer. That, like everything else, must be controlled by supply and demand. If there are a dozen jobbers wanting to sell to one man, they are going to sell him at a very much less price than if there was one jobber selling to a dozen purchasers. So it is with the retail merchants. The jobber buys from the manufacturer and other jobbers buy from the manufacturer. It is supposed that they all buy at the same price. They are all wanting to sell their goods to customers. The customers come and apply to the jobbers for the sale to them of the goods which they desire to purchase. If one jobber attempts extortion upon the retailer, he goes to another jobber, and if that one offers to extort, he goes to another, and so on; and each one will underbid the other, unless there be a trust among the jobbers.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me a minute?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. We ought not to be too hard on the jobber or the retailer there.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am trying to defend the jobber and the retailer from the charges that have been made against them by Senators on the other side. They are not to blame.

Mr. SCOTT. You must take into consideration that the manufacturer ships out in large packages and, as I tried to make it plain, there is a certain percentage of breakage. Five to 15 per cent is the breakage in handling. The jobber unpacks that and sends it in what we would call "assorted packages" to the retailer; in other words, possibly he will send for three pitchers in a barrel, a dozen plates, a dozen cups and saucers, and so forth. Now he has to pack and repack that. He must have his help; he must have straw; he must pay his rent. He ships the goods. Again there is the breakage against the retailer. So that the price at which I showed the manufacturer made these articles ought not to be used in a ridiculous form to make it seem as though the retailer and the jobber were robbers, for there is a certain amount of expense which must be incurred for handling and doing the business.

Mr. McLAURIN. That is just exactly what I rose to defend the jobber and retailer against. It seems from what was said by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and what was said by the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT] that they have the idea that jobbers and retailers in this country are extortionists. I do not believe that.

There is only one way that the jobbers and the retailers can get the goods to the consumer at last at above a reasonable profit, and that is by a combination which amounts to a trust. Now, if anybody is willing to say—if the Senator from California or the Senator from Utah, or any other Senator, is willing to say—that those men are engaged in a trust, then we ought to, if we have not legislation sufficient to break up trusts, enact legislation that will break up trusts. But if there is no trust in the jobbing business and no trust in the retail business—and I do not believe there is, because I do not believe that these men would involve themselves in the danger of prosecution—then there is no reason to make any assailment of the jobber and the retailer. The goods will not get to the con-

sumer at last at any extortionate price if there is no trust among these people; and I do not charge nor believe there is.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator, in the instance reported here, of the manufacture of glass at the remarkably low price which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. SCOTT] has stated and demonstrated, whether he does not think that the price at last at which it is furnished to the consumer represents an extraordinary and inordinate profit?

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not. I did not understand the Senator from West Virginia—I may not have understood what he said—but I did not understand from the Senator from West Virginia that the articles of which he was speaking were held at any particular price by the retailer. I understood the Senator from West Virginia to say that certain articles which were sold at \$4.50 a dozen—

Mr. HALE. Sold for 90 cents a dozen by the manufacturer.

Mr. McLAURIN. Which were sold for \$4.50 a dozen, as I understood him to say, when there was no tariff or no protective tariff, are now selling under a protective tariff at 90 cents a dozen.

Mr. SCOTT. No. I must correct the Senator. I said when there was no competition in this country, when there were no manufactures, and we had no duty, a half-gallon glass pitcher sold for \$3—not \$3 a dozen.

Mr. McLAURIN. Then, if competition relieves that, it is competition which we want.

Mr. SCOTT. It is protection.

Mr. McLAURIN. Protection, or what is called "protection," prevents competition. That is what protection is for.

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will bear in mind, it is protection which has enabled the manufacturer to produce his article and send it out to the public at a remarkably, I may say an amazingly, low price. There is no exaction; there is no undue contribution levied upon the public by the manufacturer. It is in the other stages—by the jobber and the retailer.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, I am not prepared to say that there is any combination among the retailers of this country, but I am prepared to say that, in my opinion, the retail merchants of this country make a greater percentage of profit on their investment than is made in any other line of business in the country. It appears to me, when an article costs 41 cents to manufacture, and the retailer charges \$3.60 for that article, there is something wrong; and it is not the protective tariff system.

As I have said, there are a number of articles to which I have called the attention of the Senate as to which the duty is not a factor in the price of the article. It is either the expensive way of conducting the store, the enormous sums spent for newspaper advertisements, the high salaries paid to the clerks and managers of the business, or whatever it may be; but, nevertheless, the more excessive prices charged to the consumer are not based on the price of the articles on leaving the factories.

The cost is added after that point. If we had in this country absolutely free trade on articles like Haviland china, the price would not be materially reduced, in my opinion, but it would be just as it is to-day, charged with \$25 profit on a set where the article costs about \$11 a set.

If the Senator believes there is a combination of the retail stores throughout the country—

Mr. McLAURIN. I have denied that.

Mr. FLINT. I am not prepared to say whether or not it is true; but the Senator can find out whether it is so by going to any store in his own State and buying an article such as glassware, crockery ware, gloves, or cutlery. If he will bring that article to me, I will show there is upon it a profit of from 70 to 100 per cent between the cost at the port of New York and the price at which it is sold to the consumer.

Mr. McLAURIN. Mr. President, I rose to deny the very proposition that there was a trust or combination between those people; but there can be no way in the world to account for any opportunity they have for extortion except upon the assumption that there is a trust, because otherwise these people could not extort. If you have a dozen merchants in a little town like the one in which I live, and they are all retailing, unless they have some combination or understanding amongst themselves they can not afford to sell at any extortionate price for the reason that if A goes into B's store and B does not sell him at a reasonable profit, he will go into some other store, until he

finds a merchant who will sell to him at a reasonable profit. I do not believe, as the Senator from California has said, that there is any excessive profit made by the retail dealer. There are some cases where the profit is high. You take, for instance, ready-made clothing. The retail merchant buys a stock of ready-made clothing, and he must retail it. If he sells, out of a dozen suits of ready-made clothing that he has bought, four or five of them and has the others left on his hands, it takes off the profit on the balance of them.

He has to raise the price of them higher; he has to find a man whom that particular suit of clothing will fit. So with other articles of apparel. But that is not so with reference to calico or to worsted, nor is it so with reference to groceries. A man has 50 or 100 barrels of flour. When he sells to a customer a barrel of flour he does not have to fit him. He has the flour there, and the customer goes and buys the flour, and the balance left is just like it. There is no hard stock on his hands with reference to flour, meat, lard, or groceries, as there is with reference to clothing. So the retail merchant does not practice extortion upon the people. The retail merchant buys from the jobber, and the jobber buys from the manufacturer. The manufacturer, if he is allowed to raise the price of his goods 60 per cent by reason of the tariff on them, when he sells \$100 worth he is going to sell them for \$160. The jobber has to pay him not only the profit on the \$100 which he has invested, but he has to pay him the profit on the \$60 as well. So that that \$60 enters into the amount as well as the \$100. Then when the article comes to the retail dealer from the jobber, it comes in the proportion of 100 to 60 that he paid in the way of the tariff duty. It is like a ball of snow. You take a ball of snow and roll it, and every flake catches another flake, and that flake catches another, and so on ad infinitum, until you have a ball of snow as high as your head.

So it is when the overflow comes in the streams and you float down the trash. Every piece of trash catches another piece of trash, and it is accumulated in arithmetical progression. That is the trouble about this matter. These people do not practice extortion, but the tariff does enter into the price which the consumer pays at his door, and it cuts a considerable figure if it is a considerable tariff, and a small figure if it is a small tariff.

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator a question. Take the item of tea, which has no tariff and the cost of which is not increased to an extortionate rate by a "robber protective-tariff system," but which is free.

Mr. McLAURIN. Fortunately for tea.

Mr. GALLINGER. No; fortunately for the consumer of tea.

Mr. HALE. But does the Senator know, or does he not know, that when tea is sold by the retailer in his State or in my State or in any other State, that it is advanced three and four and five hundred per cent beyond its cost when brought in here?

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not know that.

Mr. HALE. Well, but—

Mr. LODGE. There is no question about it.

Mr. McLAURIN. I take the Senator's word for it.

Mr. HALE. At what price does the Senator buy tea in his own town?

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not buy tea.

Mr. HALE. But somebody does.

Mr. McLAURIN. I buy coffee.

Mr. HALE. The same thing is true as to coffee.

Mr. LODGE. Tea that costs in New York 16 cents a pound landed and everything paid, is retailed for 60 cents a pound.

Mr. McLAURIN. That is nearly 400 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. It is about that; and there is no duty on tea.

Mr. McLAURIN. If you put a duty of 10 cents a pound on tea, then you will put tea up to a dollar, because they will put the same extortionate advance on the price. They will put on the duty.

Mr. LODGE. If you put a duty of 10 cents a pound on tea, you would find tea was selling at a dollar, instead of at 60 cents a pound; and the additional of 40 cents would be attributed to the tariff.

Mr. McLAURIN. Of course, that is what it would be. The tariff is the foundation of it. If you set a fire up in the hedge and it burns—

Mr. LODGE. The Senator was speaking of the profits of the retailer. It is a public fact, which has been shown over and over again, that tea landed in New York at 16 cents a pound is retailed at 60 cents a pound in this country, with no tariff duty upon it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I am very glad that the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] has introduced the subject of tea here, because I realize from what he has said that he has

been having interviews with some of the importers. I, too, have had one interview with them. I have also had some letters from one tea producer.

Mr. HALE. I want to say to the Senator—

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, just wait one minute—and as it is acknowledged by the Senator that we could obtain \$10,000,000 by a duty of 10 cents a pound on tea, and it would not increase the cost of tea at all—so these importers tell me—why do we not pick up that \$10,000,000 and give protection to this infant industry down in South Carolina, where there is one tea producer? There is a poor, little puling infant industry out in the piney woods at Summerville begging the United States for help and saying if tea can get a protection of 10 cents a pound it will be the pioneer in introducing into that southern country a great industry.

Mr. HALE. Let me say to the Senator—

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator vote for it or will he have his committee report it favorably? I want to introduce the amendment. Now, I will join you. I want protection for that puling infant in South Carolina—the tea industry—and we shall get \$10,000,000 by it, too.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TILLMAN. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I have seen no importer of tea. I am merely using my everyday observation of what I see going on. No importer has knocked at my door and asked me for an interview.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thought the importers had been before the committee making their statements, copies of which they have sent to me, that if we would put 10 cents a pound on tea, the American people would get a better article of tea, instead of getting the refuse of the Chinese and other tea-producing countries, and there would be no increase in the price whatever.

Mr. HALE. If the Senator will be a little less boisterous—

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I do not see why the Senator complains of my boisterousness, when some other Senators have been cavorting around here and high horsing about as though they were in the circus which is in the city. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. I am not complaining about the Senator from South Carolina; I am not arguing the case of the importer; I am simply showing—and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] has shown it more clearly than I—that the cost of this article, upon which there is no tariff, when it percolates through the country and is bought by the consumer at his fireside is 400 per cent larger than the cost at the port of importation, with no tariff duty, showing, as an unanswerable illustration, that the tariff duty which the Republican party is bound to put on, and will keep on, for the protection of the American manufacturer against foreign competition—and that competition has never invaded this country as it does now and will do for the next ten years—has nothing of account to do with the price that is paid by the consumer.

Mr. TILLMAN. Now, will the Senator from Mississippi allow me?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. It has been one of the boasts—I will try to let my voice down just a little, because I do not want to interfere with the comfort of the Senator from Maine—

Mr. HALE. The Senator does sometimes almost stun me. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. The only objection that I find to the Senator's complaint is that others who have been much louder than I have not stunned him at all. [Laughter.]

Mr. HALE. Perhaps I did not pay to them the attention which I am bound, from my long association with the Senator and the force of his remarks, to pay to him.

Mr. TILLMAN. I thank the Senator for the implied compliment, but I just want to ask him this: Is it not one of the boasts of the Republican party that they are the purveyors of the free breakfast table, and that you could not afford to put a duty on tea because it would increase the burdens of the people who drink it? Did not the Senator from Iowa the other day taunt the Committee on Finance with not daring to touch it?

Mr. HALE. Quite likely.

Mr. TILLMAN. And yet you did not find any fault with his loud voice. [Laughter.] Now, I ask the Senator again, Why not give me protection for this industry in South Carolina?

Mr. HALE. I think the Republican party, if the Senator believes that he has got a real industry—

Mr. TILLMAN. I have got a real industry. One man down there produces 15,000 pounds of tea.

Mr. HALE. If that can become a prosperous and leading contributor to the industries of the United States as against foreign competition—never so dangerous as now and as it will be in the next ten years—then the Republican party will adopt his bantling. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. TILLMAN. I can only assure you that this gentleman, Doctor Shepherd, who has been experimenting with tea culture for twenty years, has reached that point where, like all the others in this country who are seeking to increase their profits, wants enough protection to increase his price. He knows that as soon as he would get 10 cents per pound additional, it would raise the value of his tea. I do not believe in the doctrine which the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Scott] and the Senator from California [Mr. Flint] have promulgated that the tariff has nothing to do with the price, else why are these protected industries so clamorous, why are they burdening us with their petitions through the mails, and why were their committees and lobbyists in the House when this bill was pending there, and why are they in the Senate now, begging with tears in their eyes not to "touch mine?"

Mr. GALLINGER. They want to save their lives.

Mr. HALE. We do not want them driven out of business.

Mr. TILLMAN. Do not want them driven out of business?

Mr. HALE. And we do not mean that they shall be driven out of business.

Mr. TILLMAN. Nobody wants them driven out of business; but is anybody fooled by the proposition that the tariff does not increase the price?

Mr. FLINT and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. To whom does the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. McLAURIN. I was yielding to the dialogue between the Senator from Maine and the Senator from South Carolina.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That seems to be concluded. Now, to whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator from California [Mr. Flint] first rose, and I yield to him. Afterwards I will yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot].

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. McLAURIN] a moment ago called attention to clothing. I have an illustration as to clothing, to which I thought I would call his attention, which shows, as I contend, that even with woolen goods the duty is not a factor in increasing the price to the consumer. I understand that the cost of the cloth, bindings, and finishings of all kinds of a \$10 suit is about \$2.25. Everything else in connection with it is labor. I will give as an illustration the very highest class of goods. I am told by the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot], who is an expert on woollens and the woolen schedule, that there is probably not a Senator in this room who wears a piece of goods that has cost as much as this. I want to call the Senator's attention to what the cost of the very highest class English goods would amount to. A full suit takes about 3½ yards. At a cost of \$2 a yard for the cloth, that would be about \$7.50. The duty on that cloth would be \$5.39. The total cost would be \$12.89. I am advised that there is not a tailor in the city of Washington of high class who makes a suit to order of the character of goods referred to in this illustration—

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator must have understood that I was not speaking about a suit made to order, because then every suit would fit. I was talking about "hand-me-downs."

Mr. FLINT. I will refer to "hand-me-downs," too, if the Senator will permit me to finish the illustration.

Mr. McLAURIN. Every suit would fit the man, so that there would have been no hard stock. The Senator can not illustrate my proposition by referring to the people who wear tailor-made suits.

Mr. FLINT. I realize that the Senator from Mississippi and myself do not indulge in tailor-made suits. The materials in a high-priced tailor-made suit that costs \$12.89 to them would sell for \$50 to \$75 a suit. This same class of goods in the "hand-me-downs" to which the Senator refers costs from \$30 to \$40. Is the \$5.39 duty that is charged on that piece of cloth to protect the American manufacturer a factor in the \$30 or \$35 that is paid to the clothing merchant for that suit of clothes, made from the very highest class of goods that is sold on the market?

Mr. McLAURIN. Will the Senator answer this question: How much is the tariff on the ready-made clothing when it is brought in here ready-made? That is the way to get at that; not what the cloth costs, but how much is the price of the goods when they come in or the price of the goods when they are sent to the retail merchant.

Mr. FLINT. The cost of the class of goods to which I refer is \$12.89.

Mr. McLAURIN. That is, sold by the manufacturer?

Mr. FLINT. That is the cost of the cloth landed in this country.

Mr. McLAURIN. How much is the tariff on it?

Mr. FLINT. The tariff duty is \$5.39 and the goods cost \$7.50. It is the very highest class of goods put upon the market.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. McLAURIN. I promised to yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] next.

Mr. BACON. I want to give the Senator the figures.

Mr. McLAURIN. Very well.

Mr. BACON. On page 53, of this document furnished to us, the Senator will find the following:

Wearing apparel—Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel, made up or manufactured, wholly or in part, not specially provided for—86.61 per cent.

The Senator wanted to know the ad valorem. It is 86.61.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am much obliged to the Senator from Georgia. Now I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I was going to refer to the question of why we want a duty if things are so very cheap here, as suggested by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Tillman]. Let me give one particular case that I know of; and I know of many such cases. Take oxalic acid. It has been manufactured in Germany for years and years. It was formerly sold to the American consumer here at 9 cents a pound. A few years ago some gentlemen thought that they could manufacture oxalic acid in this country and sell it for at least 9 cents a pound. It was free of duty at that time. A manufactory was established. They began the manufacture of oxalic acid, but just so soon as the American manufacturer placed oxalic acid on the market the Germans cut the price to 8 cents. The Americans still manufactured it; so the Germans cut the price to 7 cents, and then the manufacturers here commenced to struggle, and did not know how long they could last. The Germans then cut the price to 6 cents, and the manufactories of oxalic acid in this country were closed. Just as soon as they closed up the American manufactories and had the American market, the Germans advanced the price to 8 cents and to 8½ cents; and when the Americans again started to manufacture oxalic acid, the Germans ran the price down to 5½ cents a pound until they closed them up. That is why in this bill we propose a duty on oxalic acid to protect the American manufacturer from the German manufacturer. I can see now from past experience in the manufacture of this one article that if a sufficient duty is not placed upon that article the Germans will produce it and charge the American people just as much as the American manufacturer could make it for and sell it in this country. That is only one case; but I can point to plenty, if you want them, right now.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McLAURIN. Yes, sir; I yield for a question, but after that I should like to get back and go over the field and take up these interruptions.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will stick a peg or two here, if the Senator will stand by it. I want to say to the Senator from Utah that it is not on a little article like that where the trouble comes; it is not from that source that the complaints come. I agree that if there was a monopoly of the American market and the Europeans had no competition here whatsoever, they could practice extortion on us, but the theory of protection, when it began away back yonder, was that as soon as a duty was levied, enough to give the American manufacturers an opportunity to compete so that they would grow strong enough and the profit of the business due to protection would be such after a while as to promote competition and bring the price down, the competition in America would relieve us from oppression at home and abroad; but have we found that to be the case?

Do we not see that as soon as the American manufacturers have reached the point where they feel the competition of each other they combine and form a trust and then fix the price, because we have got a local monopoly protected by the tariff wall, and hence we have the steel trust and every other trust in America, almost, except the Standard Oil, which is not a trust in any way, but a monopoly, created by the genius and money and unscrupulous methods and railroad discrimination and all that kind of thing? The American consumer wants to get protection at home from the trusts, and so long as you keep this tariff wall between him and competition somewhere he is at the mercy of men like Carnegie and Schwab.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. McLAURIN. Will the Senator allow me just a few words? In a moment I will yield to him.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well; go right along.

Mr. McLAURIN. Just let me ask to make an interruption in my own speech. [Laughter.]

Mr. SMOOT. I beg the Senator's pardon. I do not want to interrupt.

Mr. McLAURIN. I will yield to the Senator in a moment. Now, Mr. President, I will get back to where I was when this dialogue between the Senator from Maine and the Senator from South Carolina started. The Senator from South Carolina has said so many things in reference to this matter so much better than I could say them that it relieves me of a great deal that I was going to try to say.

As I said, I am not familiar with tea. Jocularly, I said a while ago that I did not buy tea. We use very little tea, and we use very little tea in our section, and I am not so familiar with it as I am with coffee, and if a tariff of 10 cents a pound on tea will not raise the price of tea to the consumer, I think it ought to be put on, because it will give us considerable revenue and thus relieve the Treasury.

While I am on my feet I am going to say that there is an amendment, as I recollect, introduced the other day by the chairman of the committee, putting a tariff of 5 cents a pound, I think it was, on coffee. Am I right about that?

Mr. TILLMAN. That is the maximum and the minimum, in the event of some other country discriminating against us.

Mr. McLAURIN. There is a tariff proposed on coffee of 5 cents a pound.

Mr. HALE. No; not to any schedule.

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not know whether it is to any schedule.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is permissible by the proclamation of the President.

Mr. HALE. That is another proposition.

Mr. TILLMAN. It is a double-barreled proposition.

Mr. McLAURIN. If I have any proper conception of its constitutional power, Congress can not delegate such power to the President.

Mr. HALE. That raises another question. There has been no amendment offered putting this article on the schedule at the rate of duty suggested.

Mr. McLAURIN. But there is a proposition to let the President put it on.

Mr. HALE. Oh, no.

Mr. McLAURIN. What is the amendment?

Mr. HALE. Let the Senator read it. It will tell its own story.

Mr. McLAURIN. I read it hurriedly the other day. What is the amount—5 cents a pound?

Mr. HALE. Five cents a pound.

Mr. McLAURIN. On what is that 5 cents? Is it not on coffee?

Mr. HALE. It is on coffee.

Mr. McLAURIN. Ten cents on tea and 5 cents on coffee?

Mr. HALE. That is only in relation to the maximum and minimum, affected by discriminations which foreign countries may put upon our products.

Mr. McLAURIN. But it may be put on coffee under this bill?

Mr. HALE. It may—

Mr. McLAURIN. By whom?

Mr. HALE (continuing). If there are discriminations made against us.

Mr. McLAURIN. By whom will it be put on?

Mr. HALE. By Congress.

Mr. McLAURIN. By an act passed here?

Mr. HALE. Certainly.

Mr. McLAURIN. Who declares whether it becomes effective and operative or not?

Mr. HALE. Congress.

Mr. ALDRICH. The President.

Mr. HALE. Congress declares it and leaves it to the President to settle the question of fact. That is all.

Mr. McLAURIN. There are two Senators answering. One Senator says the President, and the other Senator says Congress. The Senator from Maine says Congress, and the Senator from Rhode Island says the President.

Mr. ALDRICH. The President is the agent of Congress.

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not know of any constitutional power in Congress to appoint any agent to fix any tariff under any circumstances. But if that is so, the proposition is to put a tariff of 5 cents a pound on coffee under certain contingencies. Is not that true?

Mr. ALDRICH. I hope the Senator will not go into the maximum and minimum matter now.

Mr. TILLMAN. Do not raise the constitutional question.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am going to raise it.

Mr. ALDRICH. When we get to that, I will be glad to discuss it.

Mr. McLAURIN. Will the Senator deny that under certain contingencies, with that amendment a part of the bill, there can be and will be a tariff of 5 cents a pound on coffee?

Mr. ALDRICH. Unquestionably there will be. If any country producing coffee discriminates against us to an extent which in the opinion of the President creates a discrimination, then the Congress imposes a duty.

Mr. McLAURIN. That is what I was saying—that under certain contingencies there will be a tax of 5 cents a pound on coffee. When you put that 5 cents a pound on coffee—I have gotten that far, and I will proceed with my argument—which costs 8 cents a pound, do you tell me that it will not get to the consumer at a higher price than if the 5 cents a pound were off?

Mr. LODGE. It now costs 35 cents to the consumer, and it costs 8 cents to import it.

Mr. McLAURIN. Some kind which some people drink may cost 35 cents a pound, but the coffee that some others drink costs much less than that.

Mr. LODGE. No; I am speaking of the ordinary coffee. There is that margin of profit on the coffee sold.

Mr. HALE. It is a great question, whether it will impose upon the consumer a single cent of added cost to him.

Mr. DU PONT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. McLAURIN. I do.

Mr. DU PONT. I merely want to say that the Senator forgets that the duty on coffee would not apply generally to all coffees, but only to the coffees that come from certain countries.

Mr. McLAURIN. It does not make any difference where it comes from, if a man has to pay it.

What I was going to say is that I have not looked at the price of coffee lately, but it has been but a little while since there was a certain brand of coffee that was selling to the people who are in such circumstances that they could not buy the highest grade of coffee, at 9 cents a pound by the retailer.

Mr. GALLINGER. That is not coffee at all.

Mr. McLAURIN. I know it was selling in my town at 9 cents a pound. I can not state exactly the time when it was selling at that figure, but it was some time ago.

Mr. ALDRICH. There would not be over 5 per cent of coffee in that mixture.

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not know the per cent of coffee, but it was coffee that people were compelled to use by reason of their inability to buy the finer qualities of coffee. A great many people were compelled to use it.

Mr. HALE. I do not think the Senator ever drank a cup of that mixture.

Mr. McLAURIN. I reckon I have. I have drunk all sorts of coffee.

Mr. TILLMAN. I desire to state to the Senator from Mississippi and the Senators from New England that any market report—for instance, the New York Commercial or the New York Sun—shows what coffee is sold for by the importers in the original bags as they come from Rio Janeiro or any other coffee-producing country. It is 6 to 8 cents a pound green, and, of course, when it is parched it loses, we will say, 25 per cent, which would add that much to its cost when it is parched. If it is ground—

Mr. McLAURIN. I am not talking about parched coffee. I am talking about coffee when it comes in.

Mr. TILLMAN. You were talking about green coffee, such as you and I have been buying all our lives, out of the original sacks as they come from Brazil. It costs 6 to 8 cents.

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not suppose that this bill proposes to put the duty on parched coffee, but on the coffee as it comes from a foreign country and is imported into this country. That is where the 5 cents comes in. I know the fact—I think I do, and if I am mistaken in it I will take great pleasure in correcting it, but I am pretty sure my recollection is not at fault in that—that coffee was selling at 9 cents a pound.

Now, do you tell me that if you put 5 cents on the coffee when it comes into this country it will not raise the price of the coffee, or if you put it at 12 cents or 15 cents a pound that it will not raise the price of coffee? I know I am within the limits when I say I have seen coffee sold at 11 cents a pound. Do you tell me that if you put 5 cents on that coffee it will not raise the price to the consumer? It is bound to do it.

Then, another thing. Nearly everybody in the country uses coffee. It has gotten to be so that it is not a luxury, but the poorest people in the country are compelled to have their cup

of coffee for breakfast. Are you going to put a tax on that poor individual, who has to work from early morn to dewy eve, and then deny yourselves the luxury of paying an income tax?

Mr. ALDRICH rose.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Senator, I suppose, rose to interrupt me?

Mr. ALDRICH. I rose simply for the purpose of recalling the Senator, if I could, to the discussion of the paragraph now under consideration.

Mr. McLAURIN. I was drawn off from that by the Senator from Maine, who is always interesting, and I like to follow him in any discussion, wherever he may go. Then I was drawn off again by the Senator from California, and I believe I will take him up right now. That Senator says that the wholesale price of a suit of clothes is \$12.

Mr. FLINT. Twelve dollars and eighty-nine cents.

Mr. McLAURIN. Twelve dollars and eighty-nine cents; and by the time it gets to the consumer it is \$30.

Mr. FLINT. The ready-made suit is \$30; the very lowest.

Mr. McLAURIN. Does the Senator undertake to say that in two jumps, first to the jobber and then to the retailer, it has gone up to the consumer from \$12 to \$30?

Mr. FLINT. The difference in it represents the profits and the wages paid to American workmen.

Mr. McLAURIN. There are no wages paid to American workmen in selling it, except to the clerks.

Mr. FLINT. The manufacture of the cloth into the suit.

Mr. McLAURIN. The wholesale price for this suit of clothes, I understand, at which the manufacturer sells it to the jobber, is \$12.89.

Mr. FLINT. The cost of the cloth in the suit is \$12.89.

Mr. McLAURIN. Oh! I want to know what is the cost of the suit of clothes when it goes from the manufacturer to the jobber. What is the cost of the suit of clothes?

Mr. FLINT. From whom?

Mr. McLAURIN. From the manufacturer to the jobber.

Mr. FLINT. The difference in the cost of manufacture is simply a question of the amount paid for wages to American workmen and the difference in the amount of labor and the character of the manufacture of each suit. In the ready-made suit it is a matter of making 100 or 200 of the same kind, and with the suit made to order it is a matter of one suit, and it is all represented in the question of labor.

Mr. McLAURIN. There is no labor in the sale to the retailer by the jobber or in the sale by the retailer to the consumer. The Senator, instead of taking the suit of clothes that is sold by the manufacturer to the jobber and basing his profit on that, goes back and takes the cloth that is put in it and estimates the amount of labor put in it. That is not the way to get at the profit made by the jobber and by the retailer. It does not measure the profit that is made by the retailer and the jobber. The Senator was talking about the amount of profit that the retailer and the jobber make. That is not taken into account in the amount of profit made by the retailer and the jobber. The Senator is entirely off on that.

Now, it is utterly impossible to conceive how it can be that the protectionist wants for his factory a tariff that will allow him to raise the price of his goods to the jobber, or to the retail merchant, or to whoever buys it, and yet that does not come out of the consumer. It is utterly impossible to believe that. It used to be the doctrine of the protectionists that the foreigner paid the tax in this country. They have abandoned that now. You never hear from any intelligent protectionist now that the foreigners pay the tax in this country. They have all left that, and say there is not any trouble; that the consumer does not pay it, that the foreigner does not pay it. Does the jobber pay it? Does the retail merchant pay it? Somebody is bound to pay the tariff. It does not drop from the sky, and besides if you are going to raise your extortionate tariff so high as to prohibit the importation of foreign goods into this country, what is the use of talking about a tariff for revenue? You cut off all communication with foreign countries; you cut off all importations into this country. You get no revenue. Where are you going to get your revenue?

But I have taken up more time than I intended when I took the floor, and I would have been through with what I intended to say long ago had it not been that I was diverted by these interruptions, which have taken me, as the Senator has well said, far off from the schedule which we were discussing.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I merely want to call attention—

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. LODGE. It is not in reference to this matter. I merely wish to call attention to an example as to where the duty is al-

ways added to the cost of the article. One example is as good as a dozen. This happens to be a clear one.

The article saccharine, which is a coal-tar product, cost, in 1895, \$47.06 a pound. Owing to improved methods of manufacture and discoveries, it fell in 1896 to \$6.02 a pound, in 1897 to \$5.05, in 1898, after the Dingley rate was imposed, to \$3.72. Up to the time of the Dingley tariff the duty was 25 per cent ad valorem. Under the Dingley tariff a specific duty of \$1.50 a pound and 10 per cent ad valorem were put upon it. The price then was \$3.72; then \$3.83 in 1898.

Mr. McLAURIN. What commodity is that?

Mr. LODGE. Saccharine. It has fallen steadily from that time until to-day it is selling at 72 cents a pound. The specific duty alone is \$1.50; it has not been changed; but the article has gone steadily down until it is now selling at 72 cents a pound. As I have said, the specific duty alone is \$1.50, and where is it added?

Mr. McLAURIN. What is the necessity of a specific duty of \$1.50 a pound if it is selling for 72 cents a pound?

Mr. LODGE. We have reduced it, of course.

I merely want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that under the protective tariff that article has decreased steadily in price, and it is now 72 cents a pound. When the duty was put on, it was \$5.05 a pound. It has fallen to 72 cents a pound under the operation of the duty and the development of home competition. If you develop an industry in this country, you add to the world's competition. If you extinguish an industry in this country, the world's competition is just so much less.

Domestic competition has reduced that article of saccharine from \$5.05 a pound to 72 cents per pound. Of course the duty, being specific and ad valorem, has increased enormously, owing to the reduction of price. But the fact remains that the duty has not only not been added, but that we are getting for 72 cents what we paid \$5.05 a pound for when the duty was put on.

Mr. McLAURIN. The argument of the Senator from Massachusetts has the fallacy of all protective arguments, and that is that it proceeds upon the idea of post hoc, propter hoc, a logic that is not worth anything in the world.

Mr. LODGE. That is all right, but it does not get rid of the facts.

Mr. McLAURIN. The facts have nothing to do in a thousand instances. The facts are that whenever you have competition you have a low price for an article.

Mr. LODGE. But the price was higher under the low duty than under the high duty. Where does the consumer suffer?

Mr. McLAURIN. If that be true, then there is no necessity for the high duty, unless the Senator from Massachusetts wants to break down all the industries, because their idea is to put up a high tariff in order to protect the industry. Now, if a lower—

Mr. LODGE. The duty is needed to develop the industry.

Mr. McLAURIN. But if a lower duty will develop it better than a higher duty—

Mr. LODGE. It has developed it. The result is that instead of the consumer paying \$5 to the foreigner he now pays 72 cents. What difference does the duty make? You can make it anything you want. The importer can not pay \$1.50 specific duty per pound when it costs only 72 cents.

Mr. McLAURIN. Here is the woolen schedule. Let us take the facts on that.

Mr. LODGE. I am glad the Senator goes off on the woolen schedule.

Mr. McLAURIN. I am as much entitled to go off on the woolen schedule as the Senator is to go off on saccharine.

Mr. LODGE. That is all right. It is an easier one to deal with.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. McLAURIN. Certainly.

Mr. GORE. I want to ask the Senator from Mississippi not to direct the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to the woolen schedule until the Senator from Massachusetts states how high the duty would have to be on the article to which he has referred until the consumer would get it for nothing. That seems to be the tendency of his argument.

Mr. McLAURIN. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma for the suggestion. I should like to hear the Senator from Massachusetts answer it.

Mr. LODGE. I did not hear the question.

Mr. McLAURIN. The question of the Senator from Oklahoma to the Senator from Massachusetts was, How high would the duty on saccharine have to be before the consumer could

get it for nothing, if the higher the duty the cheaper the article?

Mr. LODGE. The height of the duty has nothing to do with it at present, because the duty is twice the value of the article, the duty having been established when it was \$5.05 a pound. I can predict exactly what would occur if the duty were taken off and domestic competition destroyed.

Mr. McLAURIN. What is the duty now?

Mr. LODGE. The duty now is \$1.50, and it was in 1897.

Mr. McLAURIN. What is the duty as proposed in the bill as it comes from the Senate committee?

Mr. LODGE. I was going to turn to it and tell the Senator just what the duty is on saccharine.

Mr. CULBERSON. Seventy-five cents.

Mr. McLAURIN. Seventy-five cents, the Senator from Texas says.

Mr. LODGE. It has been cut in two.

Mr. McLAURIN. If it is being sold here for 70 cents, what is the necessity for a duty of 75 cents?

Mr. LODGE. It is being sold for 72 cents.

Mr. McLAURIN. Seventy-two cents. Then a duty of 75 cents is absolutely prohibitory. I should like to ask the Senator from Massachusetts if he supposes that a duty of 5 cents a pound on coffee would ever reduce the price of coffee below what it is now?

Mr. LODGE. I certainly do not, because we grow no coffee in the United States. Therefore there can be no domestic competition.

Mr. McLAURIN. Then there can be but one result—to raise the price of coffee to every coffee drinker in all this country, and as the poorer class of people—the laboring people—drink about as much coffee as the wealthiest—the millionaires—they will pay nearly all of the tax that we raise from coffee.

Mr. LODGE. The country which follows the Democratic doctrine and has a strict revenue tariff imposes a duty both on tea and coffee. That is England.

Mr. McLAURIN. This country does not impose—

Mr. LODGE. I say England does, with free trade.

Mr. McLAURIN. The Democratic party never imposed any tariff on coffee, and as for England, I do not think the Democratic party can be accused of following the course of England half as much as the Republican party, and especially the Senator from Massachusetts. And on tobacco, are you going to reduce the price of tobacco by a tariff on it? Nearly all the laboring men of this country use tobacco, and you put a high tariff on that. Are you going to reduce the price of tobacco by a duty on it?

Mr. LODGE. Tobacco and spirits have always been considered in every country a proper subject of excise and taxation, because no man need use them unless he wants to.

Mr. McLAURIN. I do not use tobacco, fortunately for me.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. McLAURIN. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have here the amendment to which the Senator from Mississippi alluded, providing for a tax on coffee unless the President shall by proclamation declare there is no undue discrimination.

I also have the prices of coffee to the jobbers in New York. Rio, which is the coffee most generally used, sells at from 6 to 9 cents; Java, Mocha, and the other finer grades range from 13 to 20 cents. If the Senator wants to insert them—

Mr. LODGE. What do they retail for?

Mr. McLAURIN. I will ask that they be inserted in the RECORD without taking the time to read them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

After section 1 insert a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 2. That from and after the 31st day of March, 1910, except as otherwise specially provided for in this section, there shall be levied, collected, and paid on all articles when imported from any foreign country into the United States, or into any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), the rates of duty prescribed by the schedules and paragraphs of the dutiable list of section 1 of this act, and in addition thereto 25 per cent ad valorem; and there shall also be levied, collected, and paid the following rates of duty on articles upon the free list in said section 1, viz: On coffee, 5 cents per pound; on tea, 10 cents per pound; which rates shall constitute the general tariff of the United States: *Provided*, That whenever and so long as the President shall be satisfied, in view of the character of the concessions granted by the minimum tariff of the United States, that the government of any foreign country imposes no terms or restrictions, either in the way of tariff rates or provisions, trade or other regulations, charges, exactions, or in any other manner, directly or indirectly, upon the importation into or the sale in such foreign country of any agricultural, manufactured, or other product of the United States, which unduly discriminate against the United States or the products

thereof, and that such foreign country imposes no export bounty or prohibition upon the exportation of any article to the United States which unduly discriminates against the United States or the products thereof, and that such foreign country accords to the agricultural, manufactured, or other products of the United States treatment which is reciprocal and equivalent, then, upon proclamation to this effect by the President of the United States, all articles when imported into the United States, or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), from such foreign country shall, except as otherwise herein provided, be admitted under the terms of the minimum tariff of the United States as prescribed by section 1 of this act."

Brazil grades.

[Quotations are for invoice lines.]

| | RIO. | Cents. |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|--------|
| 3s | ----- | 9 |
| 4s | ----- | 8½ |
| 5s | ----- | 8¼ |
| 6s | ----- | 8¼ |
| 7s | ----- | 8 |
| 8s | ----- | 7½ |
| 3s | SANTOS. | 9½ |
| 4s | ----- | 9 |
| 5s | ----- | 8½ |
| 6s | ----- | 8¼ |
| 7s | ----- | 8 |
| 8s | ----- | 7½ |
| | Roasted Brazil package coffee. | Cents. |
| Ariosa brand, net | ----- | 16½ |
| Lion brand | ----- | 13 |
| Cordova and Eagle brand, net | ----- | 13½ |

Mild grades.

EAST INDIA.

| | Cents. |
|-------|--------|
| Mocha | 14@16 |
| Java | 13@14½ |

LIBERIAN.

Mr. McLAURIN. I wish to say one word in reference to what the Senator from Massachusetts said, that nobody needs to use tobacco. Nobody needs to use bacon, or beef, or venison, or any particular edible. But tobacco has become a necessity with probably three-fifths and maybe four-fifths of the people, of the men of this country, and they are the people who do the work and who develop the country.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask what is the pending question. I think paragraph 97 has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Paragraph 97 was passed over.

Mr. CUMMINS. We have not reached paragraph 97.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think so.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have been watching pretty carefully. The discussion hitherto has been about paragraphs 95 and 96.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think 96 has been agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Paragraph 96 has been agreed to.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have an amendment to offer to paragraph 97.

Mr. KEAN. Let it be read.

Mr. LODGE. Paragraph 97?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa offers an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 3, page 26, strike out the words "one and three-eighths cents" and insert "one and one-eighth cents;" in line 5 strike out the word "seven-eighths" and insert in lieu "one-half;" in lines 6 and 7 strike out the words "two and three-eighths" and insert "two;" in line 9 strike out the word "six-eighths" and insert "two-eighths;" in lines 10 and 11 strike out the words "three and two-eighths" and insert "two and seven-eighths;" in line 12 strike out the words "six-eighths" and insert "one-eighth;" and in line 13 strike out the words "four and two-eighths" and insert "three and one-half."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, this paragraph, as all Senators know, relates to the ordinary common window glass of the country. I desire to admit at the outset that the price of American-made window glass in the United States is very low. I do not believe the users of window glass are paying any more for it than they ought to pay. In other words, I do not believe that the manufacturers of common window glass are making more than they ought to make. There is at the present time the keenest and the most general competition among the manufacturers of window glass, and that competition has reduced the price of glass to the lowest profitable point, as I understand the subject. Nevertheless, I believe that the duties now imposed upon window glass, and which are reenacted in the bill as reported by the Senate committee, are altogether too high, and are easily beyond any future result in imposing upon the consumers of this commodity an unwarranted price for it.

I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a table I have in my hand, and which I have verified and have reason to believe states the case accurately. Upon glass of the smaller

size, namely, not exceeding 10 by 15, the duty as proposed by this bill, which I understand is the duty of the Dingley law, is 72 cents per box. I have reduced these duties to boxes in order that the subject might be more easily understood. We all know that there are substantially 50 pounds in a box. The duty is 72 cents upon the smaller size. The selling price in the United States at this time is \$1.14. The foreign cost at this time is 89 cents. If the duty were added to the foreign cost the box would be worth in this country, without taking into consideration the difference in freight, \$1.61, whereas it is being sold at \$1.14.

Upon the next size the duty is 98 cents. It is being sold everywhere now at \$1.20. If the duty were added to the foreign cost it would be \$1.93; and so on through this table, which I will ask leave to have inserted in my observations upon this subject.

The table referred to is as follows:

All prices per box of 50 square feet.

| | Foreign cost at Antwerp (without duty). | Duty at proposed Payne-Aldrich rates. | Foreign price and duties. | Selling price, American-made glass. |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| SINGLE THICK. | | | | |
| Not exceeding 10 by 15 | \$0.89 | \$0.72 | \$1.61 | \$1.14 |
| Exceeding 10 by 15, not exceeding 14 by 20 | .95 | .98 | 1.93 | 1.20 |
| Exceeding 14 by 20, not exceeding 16 by 24 | .95 | .98 | 1.93 | 1.26 |
| Exceeding 16 by 24, not exceeding 20 by 30 | 1.23 | 1.24 | 2.47 | 1.82 |
| Exceeding 20 by 30, not exceeding 24 by 30 | 1.32 | 1.24 | 2.56 | 1.85 |
| Exceeding 24 by 30, not exceeding 24 by 36 | 1.32 | 1.44 | 2.76 | 1.40 |
| Exceeding 24 by 36, not exceeding 30 by 40 | 1.40 | 1.70 | 3.10 | 1.51 |
| Exceeding 30 by 40, not exceeding 30 by 50 | 1.53 | 1.96 | 3.49 | 1.73 |
| Exceeding 30 by 50, not exceeding 30 by 54 | 1.65 | 1.96 | 3.61 | 1.88 |
| DOUBLE THICK. | | | | |
| Not exceeding 10 by 15 | 1.24 | 1.10 | 2.34 | 1.51 |
| Exceeding 10 by 15, not exceeding 14 by 20 | 1.33 | 1.50 | 2.83 | 1.65 |
| Exceeding 14 by 20, not exceeding 16 by 24 | 1.33 | 1.50 | 2.83 | 1.77 |
| Exceeding 16 by 24, not exceeding 20 by 30 | 1.85 | 1.90 | 3.75 | 1.97 |
| Exceeding 20 by 30, not exceeding 24 by 30 | 1.78 | 1.90 | 3.68 | 1.99 |
| Exceeding 24 by 30, not exceeding 24 by 36 | 1.78 | 2.20 | 3.98 | 2.02 |
| Exceeding 24 by 36, not exceeding 30 by 40 | 1.91 | 2.60 | 4.51 | 2.17 |
| Exceeding 30 by 40, not exceeding 30 by 54 | 2.10 | 3.00 | 5.10 | 2.37 |
| Exceeding 30 by 54, not exceeding 30 by 60 | 2.28 | 3.00 | 5.28 | 2.42 |
| Exceeding 30 by 60, not exceeding 30 by 64 | 2.77 | 3.00 | 5.77 | 2.62 |
| Exceeding 30 by 64, not exceeding 30 by 70 | 3.24 | 3.00 | 6.24 | 2.68 |
| Exceeding 30 by 70 | 3.87 | 3.00 | 6.87 | 3.19 |

Mr. CUMMINS. The conclusion that I reach from it is that, generally speaking, the duties are almost as great as the selling price. I take it for granted that the selling price at the present time is not below cost, with at least a small profit added. It seems to me that we ought not to give this industry the opportunity to combine and raise the prices to an unreasonable point by interposing duties that are excessive as compared with the foreign cost and the home cost.

I notice in the hearings before the House committee one of the first bits of evidence is a letter from the W. R. Jones Glass Company, of Morgantown, W. Va. I do not know this company; I do not know Mr. Jones; but I take it for granted that he knows something about the subject of which he speaks. Although he is a manufacturer of window glass, he suggested to the Ways and Means Committee of the House a reduction of these duties below the point I have asked in the amendment I have just offered. I will take the liberty of reading that portion of his communication to the House committee. He says:

MORGANTOWN, W. VA., November 30, 1908.

HON. SERENO E. PAYNE,
Chairman Ways and Means Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In your favor of the 26th, a reply to my letter of the 24th, you infer that the committee would be glad if I would send them a statement showing the cost of manufacturing window glass in this country and Europe, and especially the labor cost, and also the relative freight rates.

As to the actual cost of labor in Europe, we are unable to give you the exact figures. We can only give it to you as we understand and learn it from workmen that have worked in Belgium and other countries and are now working for us.

Mr. SCOTT. What volume is the Senator reading from?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am reading from the tariff hearings on earthenware and glassware, Schedule B, page 1123.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. Jones continues:

A former manufacturer, who carefully investigated the costs some years ago in Europe, informed me that the cost of raw material and fuel for the manufacture of window glass is as cheap in this country as in Europe, and in that respect foreign manufacturers have no ad-

vantage over us. But their system of manufacturing is very different from ours, and their cost of labor much less than the hand blowing in this country.

We learn from intelligent Belgian workmen now employed by us the labor cost in their country, and we figure that the labor cost of the average-size 50-foot box of window glass, 24 by 30, in Belgium would be about 44 cents. The labor cost for the same size, single, at the present skilled scale now in force in this country would be \$1.06. The larger the size of glass the greater the cost in this country.

As to freight rates, we are informed that window glass is used largely as ballast in ships, and can be put on the docks at New York and Boston at a lower freight rate than manufacturers in this country can do.

These are his premises, and I certainly think that they must be adopted by those who are in favor of equalizing the cost abroad and the cost at home. It states the case as strongly for the manufacturer as I think it can fairly be stated. Now, mark what this manufacturer suggests to the Ways and Means Committee of the House. I continue to read:

In reference to lowering the tariff rate on common window glass, I would suggest—

Mr. ALDRICH. From what page is the Senator reading?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am reading from page 1123 of the House committee hearings upon Schedule B:

In reference to lowering the tariff rate on common window glass, I would suggest in the reduction of the rate that is known as the "Dingley" tariff—Schedule B, section 101, as follows:

Sizes not to exceed 10 by 15, reduce from 1½ cents per pound to 1 cent.

I have not asked so great a reduction in my amendment—

Sizes not to exceed 16 by 24, reduce from 1½ cents per pound to 1½ cents.

Again, I have not asked so great a reduction as this manufacturer says can and ought to be made. I will not read the various prices or sizes, because in each instance I have added something to the duty which this manufacturer insists should be imposed upon glass. He then continues:

The duty to be computed according to the actual weight of glass; every invoice of glass to be put on the scales and weighed, and the weight of the boxes to be deducted therefrom. We find the weight of the empty boxes to be as follows:

Then he recites the weight of the empty boxes.

Yours, very truly, W. R. Jones Glass Company, W. R. Jones, President.

I assume that this manufacturer has not understated the difference between the cost of manufacture at home and abroad. I assume that he has not consented to or suggested a greater reduction in duties than can well be sustained by this industry. This conclusion of the manufacturer from Morgantown is corroborated by the fact I originally called to the attention of the Senate, namely, that the selling price of glass, as compared with the duty on glass, must prove conclusively to any person that this duty is greatly in excess of the amount necessary to compensate the manufacturer.

Now, so long as there is competition at home—keen, effectual competition—it makes no difference what the duty is. I agree to that. I do not think it would make any difference at the present moment if there was a duty of a dollar upon glass instead of the amount that is named in this bill. Why? Because the competition among our own producers would reduce the price of the commodity to a fair American level, and that is all that we desire.

Why, then, should there be any attempt to reduce the duty? I answer my own question thus: If this industry should combine, as many industries have, and eliminate or extinguish the force of competition, then the price would be raised to an unduly high point, without any opportunity for foreign competition to operate upon this field of business.

That is the only reason why we ought to be careful with regard to the extent of duty imposed upon any article. If we have an abundance of raw material, and if we can preserve competition at home, I am perfectly willing always to take the American price, and my insistence at this time, just as it has been at former times, just as it will be throughout these entire schedules, is to see to it that the duty shall not be unreasonably high, lest, competition having been eliminated from the business, the article can be raised high above a fair American price.

There is no man here who can look at the table I have presented and reach any other conclusion. Allow me to supplement what I have said as to some of the conclusions from this table. If Belgian glass were selling in this country for the American cost—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me to ask him what he is reading from?

Mr. CUMMINS. This table.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; the statement the Senator is reading—from what book?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am reading from a pamphlet; that is, the table is from a pamphlet.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the pamphlet?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is entitled "The Tariff on Glass."

Mr. ALDRICH. It is by whom?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am unable to say. It is signed by Semon Bache & Co.

Mr. ALDRICH. Those are New York importers?

Mr. CUMMINS. I think they are partially importers. They are not, therefore, to be discredited, I hope. The table I have read is either true or false. Does the Senator from Rhode Island say that glass not exceeding 10 by 15 is not now being sold in the American market at \$1.14 cents?

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator that in 1907 there were 16,000,000 pounds of glass of this particular kind imported into the United States, which paid 1½ cents a pound duty.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will reach that phase of the matter before I shall have concluded. The statement made by the Senator is precisely right, save in one respect. I say there has not been a pound of glass imported precisely like the glass I am now considering, and the Senator can very easily verify what I say by referring to the foreign value of the glass imported, a greater value than window glass, as common, ordinary stock, glazing window glass, has been selling in this country for three years.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is barely possible there are some grades of window glass that might be selling for one-quarter of the cost. That does not change the fact as to this particular clause in this particular paragraph, covering glass 10 by 15. Under the provisions of that clause there were imported in 1907, 16,000,000 pounds, which paid 1½ cents duty.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will come to that phase of the question presently.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CUMMINS. With pleasure.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Not to interrupt the Senator, but right on that point, I notice what appears to be a discrepancy between the table furnished by the committee and the book of Imports and Duties. The figures the Senator from Rhode Island has quoted, are quoted correctly from that table; but I notice what appears to be a discrepancy between that table and the table given in Imports and Duties, on page 447.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the number of the table? Nineteen hundred and nineteen is the number of the table.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Nineteen hundred and twenty-seven is the number of the table that I thought applied.

Mr. ALDRICH. Oh, no; 1919 is the one that covers this paragraph.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. What does 1927 cover, if it does not cover this paragraph?

Mr. SMOOT. Cylinder, crown, and common window glass, unpolished.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It covers "cylinder, crown, and common window glass, unpolished."

Mr. ALDRICH. "When bent, ground, obscured, frosted," and so forth.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. That is right. I had overlooked that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will reach in a very few minutes the suggestion made by the Senator from Rhode Island with regard to the imports of glass. I want to deal with this question in an absolutely fair spirit. I am not here for the purpose of giving the importer of glass or the foreign manufacturer of glass any advantage over our own. I marvel that in every question that is propounded to me from that quarter there is the suggestion that I want to overthrow an American industry. There is no such object in my mind, no such purpose in my heart.

Mr. ALDRICH. I want, then, to call the attention of the Senator from Iowa to the fact that he overlooked the statements in the House hearings that suggested an increase of these rates by the window-glass workers, and he took the only statement contained in any of the hearings I have ever seen of somebody who wanted a reduction.

Mr. CUMMINS. The statement that I read was made by a manufacturer of window glass.

Mr. ALDRICH. And if the Senator had looked on the same page—

Mr. CUMMINS. I understand that.

Mr. ALDRICH (continuing). Of the same hearing he would have found that the National Window Glass Workers, the men engaged in this business, not only object to a decrease, but ask strenuously for an increase. I will have their testimony read after the Senator is through with his remarks.

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall be very glad to have their testimony read. It is touching and delightful to find everybody in this Chamber at this time so solicitous for the welfare of our work-

ingman. That is one point, at least, upon which we have no difference of opinion now. I trust that as we will in the coming session pass to other subjects that relate to the welfare of the laboring men we can unite in the same way and with the same concord we are now uniting.

I return to this proposition, and ask, not only the Senator from Rhode Island, but any other Senator here, whether it be or be not true that common, ordinary, neither better nor worse than usual window glass of a size not exceeding 10 by 15 inches is now selling in the markets of this country at \$1.14 a box? I take it that is true. I have taken some pains to verify generally this table.

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator say that is the price in the foreign port?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not. I read the foreign cost.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was going to ask—

Mr. CUMMINS. The foreign cost of that same box of glass is 89 cents. That is the cost abroad, not including freight or other transportation charges. But if you add the duty—

Mr. ALDRICH. How much does the Senator say the duty is?

Mr. CUMMINS. Eighty-nine cents.

Mr. ALDRICH. No; what is the amount of duty?

Mr. CUMMINS. I am speaking about the duty that would be paid on a single box of that glass.

Mr. ALDRICH. How much would the Senator say it is?

Mr. CUMMINS. I beg pardon; it is 72 cents.

Mr. ALDRICH. Then, the cost of importation is 89 cents?

Mr. CUMMINS. The foreign cost is 89 cents.

Mr. ALDRICH. The duty is 72 cents.

Mr. CUMMINS. The duty is 72 cents; so that, without counting in the freight or other transportation charges, the cost of that foreign box of glass laid down on the wharves at New York would be \$1.61.

Mr. ALDRICH. And the same glass sells in the United States for \$1.14?

Mr. CUMMINS. For \$1.14.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator tell me who could import 16,000,000 pounds of that precise glass and pay 72 cents duty and sell it in this country in competition with glass at \$1.14?

Mr. CUMMINS. No one has.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is this glass that is imported?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is a different kind of glass.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is covered by this same clause?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is covered by the same schedule.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is covered by the same clause the Senator proposes to reduce, is it not?

Mr. CUMMINS. I propose to reduce the duty on common window glass.

Mr. ALDRICH. It includes the specific article the Senator is now talking about, does it not?

Mr. CUMMINS. It would include every article I am talking about.

Mr. ALDRICH. Undoubtedly; and the importation, instead of being 16,000,000 pounds, would be how much, would the Senator conjecture?

Mr. CUMMINS. The importations would be no more than at the present time, as I will show you definitely and conclusively in a very few minutes.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand the Senator to say that there were not 16,000,000 pounds of common window glass, 10 by 15 inches square, imported in the year 1907?

Mr. CUMMINS. There were substantially the number of pounds mentioned by the Senator from Utah, as shown by this schedule, imported under this paragraph. What I have endeavored to say more than once is that the glass so imported is not in competition with the ordinary window glass used generally throughout the United States for the building of moderate homes. It is a superior quality and kind of glass which the manufacturers of this country have not attempted to make or supply the demand for.

Mr. SMOOT. And still it is ordinary, common window glass?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is sold as window glass, but sold at a very much higher price than the market price for the window glass manufactured generally in the United States.

Mr. SMOOT. I notice the value of it here given is 3.3 cents a pound.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely. The value of that glass abroad is almost twice as much as the average price of glass sold in the United States, I mean of domestic manufacture.

Mr. SMOOT. How many pounds of glass are there in a box?

Mr. CUMMINS. There are about 50 pounds in a box of single thick, and about 82 pounds, I think, in a box of double thick.

Mr. SMOOT. We are talking about common glass.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am talking about single thick.

Mr. SMOOT. The average value of that glass, of the whole 16,000,000 pounds, was only 2 cents a pound, and 50 pounds would be \$1.50 a box.

Mr. CUMMINS. What of the smaller size, if we turn to that part of it? I have endeavored very solicitously to make this presentation in a somewhat logical order; but I have no objection to going over this table with the Senator from Utah. I find that of the glass imported under the classification of cylinder, crown, and common window glass, unpolished, not exceeding 10 by 15 inches, the average value abroad was 3.3 cents per pound. That, as you will observe, would be before it reached the American wharf. That would be double the price at which common window glass of that size has been and is being sold in the United States. You can not say, I am sure, that under those conditions the glass from abroad came into competition with the glass manufactured at home.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me ask the Senator if this would not be the result of his amendment: He has asked that the present rate of duty, 42 cents, be reduced. Would not the result be that not only this higher price glass, which he claims comes under this clause, would come in, but would it not also let the common window glass in at the same time that the Senator says is now not imported?

Mr. CUMMINS. Not at all, because it is still sufficiently high to prevent the importation of the common sort of window glass until the American price should be increased 30 or 40 per cent above the price at which it is now being sold.

Mr. SMOOT. Does not the Senator believe that to-day the manufacturers of common window glass are virtually selling their product at cost, and in some instances below cost?

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I began what I had to say, if I may be permitted to remind the Senator from Utah, with the statement that I believed that the price was as low, if not lower, than it ought to be. I do not believe that the manufacturers of window glass are making a great profit in their business at the present time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire further to say as to the glass manufacturers that not only for the years 1907 and 1908, but for the last ten years, I have noticed that on all of the smaller sizes, not only of common window glass, but of plate glass as well, the statements from the companies—and I have examined their books—were that they had absolutely lost money on the small sizes.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I fancy that the same argument which would apply to plate glass would not probably apply with its full force to common window glass. We have not reached the plate-glass paragraph, and I will defer any observations which I have to make upon that subject until we reach that paragraph.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator yield to me for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. In reference to the quotation of my friend Jones, of Morgantown, you must remember that in West Virginia we have advantages which they have nowhere else. Jones has the sand right there at Morgantown. We have natural gas in West Virginia for fuel, which they do not have in other portions of the country. When you blow a cylinder of window glass, and it is split in the center and flattened out, a great many of the sheets drop and are picked up in small pieces. That is the reason why they lose money on the small sizes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I know the Senator from West Virginia is very familiar with this subject, and I shall be glad to yield to him to describe the process of the manufacture of this article to Senators generally. So far as I am concerned, I, too, am rather familiar with it, inasmuch as I was born and raised in the shadow of a window-glass factory, and, therefore, know something about how such glass is made.

It is true, as the Senator has said, that the institution at Morgantown may have some advantage over other factories less fortunately situated; but, in order to compensate for any such advantage, whether it be real or imaginary, I have not, in my amendment, sought to bring down the duty to a point at which this manufacturer said his product could be profitably manufactured in competition with the world.

I have added something on account of the very condition to which the Senator from West Virginia has referred; but I am sure it can not be the purpose of the Senator to add such a

duty to this every-day commodity, this commodity which every man who owns a house must buy, as will unduly and unnecessarily protect the interest. When I have cited the fact that window glass is selling in this country, and that it has been selling in this country for some years past, at a price that absolutely prohibits any importation of that kind of glass, although it may be classified under the same paragraph, I can not imagine that we shall perpetuate this unreasonable duty, which, although not now harmful, may become the instrument of very great injustice in the near future. To show that it may so become, I desire to read and have inserted in my remarks just a little paragraph from a paper which came into my hands the other day, called "Commoner and Glassworker." It is a paper published at Pittsburgh, and the issue of the paper from which I read is under date of April 3, 1907:

IMPERIAL GLASS COMPANY FORMED—BIG MEETING HELD AT COLUMBUS LAST THURSDAY—MATTER HAS AT LAST BEEN BROUGHT TO A FOCUS—DISTRICT MEETINGS NEXT TUESDAY—GENERAL WINDOW-GLASS NEWS.

After many months of hard work the movement to organize the window-glass manufacturers of the United States was practically brought to a focus last Thursday at Columbus, Ohio, when the plans of the Imperial Glass Company were given favorable consideration at an enthusiastic meeting at which 1,500 pots were represented. It has been announced that headquarters will be established in Pittsburgh.

A committee of seven was appointed to arrange details of incorporation, capitalization, method of stock issue, and nomination of officers. It will report at a general meeting to be held in Pittsburgh or Columbus within the next two weeks. District meetings will be held next Tuesday for the purpose of selecting permanent directors. A charter will be secured at once, and the success of the project now seems assured.

This particular project did not meet with success.

Mr. KEAN. That was two years ago.

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes, sir; two years ago last April. It had become in the meanwhile somewhat unpopular to organize combinations or corporations of this kind; and, although I have not attempted to become familiar with the details of the failure of this particular effort to combine the window-glass manufacturers of the United States, I know that it did temporarily fail; and I read this extract only to show what is so constantly in the minds of all the manufacturers in this country. The very fact that I have admitted—namely, the low price of window glass in the United States at the present time—furnishes the motive for just such combinations or concentrations as are here suggested.

If we permit this duty, which I believe to be excessive, to remain upon this product, then this experiment may be followed by another more successful; and when the window-glass manufacturers of the United States can combine themselves, they can raise the price to any point which they may think reasonable or which they may think profitable for themselves, until they meet the danger of foreign competition.

It is because such combinations have been made, and because such combinations can be made that I have asked that a full protective duty be imposed upon this commodity, but not more than an adequate protective duty. If the selling price of this commodity at the present time and for some months in the past furnishes any evidence as to the cost of producing the article, then there can be no difference of opinion that the duty imposed is more than is necessary to prevent foreign competition.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I would like to ask the Senator from Iowa how he accounts for the low price of glass which he has just described?

Mr. CUMMINS. I account for it by reason of the fact which I wish were always true. Competition, fair, reasonable, and effective competition, always reduces the price of any commodity to a reasonable profit. That is the hope and salvation of the business of this country or of any other; and if there was in the United States that competition in every field of industry, and if we could be sure that that competition would continue in full vigor, I would not be at all solicitous with respect to the duty that might be put upon any product which we could produce in sufficient quantities to supply our own demand. It is only because we are gradually extinguishing competition that it becomes so imperative that we restrain these duties to a point that will give full protection, but will give nothing more than full protection.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator from Iowa understand that these importations of glass of the smaller sizes, 10 by 15, are

used for window glass? I may put another question at the same time. Is it not a fact that these importations are almost solely for the purpose of framing pictures?

Mr. CUMMINS. I have been so informed, and I believe my information to be accurate. That is why I stated to the Senator from Rhode Island that these importations were not of the precise commodity I had attempted to describe as common ordinary window glass. I am perfectly willing, if the committee has ingenuity enough to reclassify it—and I think the committee could reclassify it—I am perfectly willing that a duty shall be put upon this higher priced and this superior article commensurate, if you please, with its value, although I think the duty I have named is a full and complete protection, even for that kind of an article.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the duty they have now of 1½ certainly has not been prohibitive in the past, and if it is lowered it certainly will not be prohibitive in the future.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I may not have been correctly informed, but my investigation into this subject has led to the conclusion that there has been no effort upon the part of the American window-glass manufacturers to supply the article which has been imported largely for use in picture framing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, my information is that it is absolutely impossible for them to do it with the present duty of 1½, and to lower it would only mean that they never can do it.

Mr. CUMMINS. So that, Mr. President, in order to protect the people from an importation of glass of a superior quality or kind—I do not know whether it can be technically described as "window glass" or not, but, at any rate, it has been imported under that paragraph—in order to protect the American manufacturer in his production of that kind of glass you ask, the Senate to impose a duty upon common stock glazing window glass that will enable the manufacturers, if they are so inclined, to lift up the price to a point that you will admit would permit extortion upon the users of this commodity. Why do you not so classify these articles as to give adequate protection upon the one without permitting the manufacturer of the other to impose upon the people of the United States?

Mr. PILES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. PILES. I have a letter here from a furniture company at Tacoma, Wash., favoring a reduction of the rate under paragraphs 97 and 100. In this connection, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to ask the chairman or some member of the committee in respect to the facts set forth in this letter.

Mr. CUMMINS. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so.

Mr. PILES. The writer of the letter says:

On window glass, the Payne bill makes no reduction on small sizes, and on the large sizes the reduction is a mere pittance. As an illustration, the duty on size 30 by 48 "is reduced" one-eighth of 1 cent per pound—less than 3 per cent—leaving still a protection considerably in excess of 100 per cent. At the "reduction" the duty on the above-named size (30 by 48) figures just \$3 for a 50-foot box of double-thick glass, such as is ordinarily used for windows. The American manufacturers are selling this same size glass to-day for \$2.49—that is, they are selling the American-made glass for 51 cents less than the duty alone on the imported article.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think I can explain.

Mr. PILES. Just let me go on and take up another statement in the letter.

Mr. CUMMINS. The matter your correspondent is there writing of is not plate glass, but the common cylinder or ground window glass.

Mr. PILES. I know; but he shows that on that glass the American manufacturer sells it for less than the tariff duty in our own market.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is true, and I will prove that by abundant evidence when we reach that paragraph.

Mr. PILES. Then he speaks of the reduction made by the Payne bill in the large sizes, which he thinks amounts to practically nothing. He says further:

On plate glass the Payne bill reduces rates on large sizes and advances them on small sizes. Practically nothing is imported in large sizes. Nearly all the importations are in the small sizes, on which the duty is advanced 25 per cent by the Payne bill. During the greater part of the year 1908 the American factories sold stock-sheet plate glass in the grade used for stores, dwellings, etc., at a range of prices which for a plate 30 by 48 inches in size was 22½ cents per square foot. The Payne bill on this size preserves the Dingley rate of 22½ cents per square foot—that is, the duty alone on the imported article is as much as the selling price of the American article.

Then he goes on to show the cost of production in this country and in foreign countries, and that there is practically none of this glass of the small sizes imported; in fact, that there is none of it imported. I find here that some 16,000,000 pounds, I think it was—

Mr. ALDRICH. That is common window glass.

Mr. PILES. That is an altogether different proposition. I wanted to get the information.

Mr. STONE. May I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Missouri is not asking me to yield to him.

Mr. STONE. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington from whom was that letter?

Mr. PILES. From furniture dealers, F. S. Harmon & Co., of Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. CUMMINS. Inasmuch as I have the floor, I should be glad to hear the colloquy that is going on between the Senator from Missouri and the Senator from Washington.

Mr. STONE. I was simply curious, for, as I listened to that letter, I happened to hold one in my hand, and found that it was in exactly the same language. [Laughter.]

Mr. PILES. The letter is from F. S. Harmon & Co., manufacturers of chairs, furniture, and window shades, of Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. STONE. Well, the one I have is from St. Louis. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. CUMMINS. With pleasure.

Mr. PAGE. I desire light, Mr. President. I think the Senator said he was brought up in the vicinity of a glass factory.

Mr. CUMMINS. That was a long time ago.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to know what the materials are which are used in the making of glass.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mainly sand.

Mr. PAGE. Well, is it a quality of sand that is easily obtainable in different parts of the country?

Mr. CUMMINS. No; it can not be obtained everywhere. We have no glass sand in our State. We have other sorts of sand, but not glass sand.

Mr. PAGE. Is it a commodity which is controlled by any combination, so far as the Senator knows?

Mr. CUMMINS. So far as I know, it is not.

Mr. PAGE. Could it be controlled?

Mr. CUMMINS. Oh, I refuse to put any limit on the power of combinations to control anything. I do not think it would be easily controlled.

Mr. PAGE. The reason I ask the question is, that in the remarkable speech by the Senator's colleague [Mr. DOLLIVER] the other day, I think he laid down the general proposition that there was no fear of any combination or any trust controlling any article manufactured in this country where the combination could not control the raw material. I should like to ask the Senator whether he agrees with his colleague in that respect?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. CUMMINS. In a moment. I desire, first, to answer the Senator from Vermont. I will explain what limitation I think ought to be put upon my colleague's statement, if the Senator from Vermont correctly repeats it, and I have no doubt he does. For instance, the cornstarch works of the country use the commonest sort of raw materials, prevalent plentifully everywhere, and yet it is as completely organized in a trust as any industry in the United States. I give that instance simply to show that there must be some modification of the statement of my colleague.

Mr. PAGE. I confess, Mr. President, that I was in doubt about that myself; but we have heard a great deal about the "Iowa idea," and I wondered whether it had penetrated both sides of the Senate or simply one side.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment, until I answer about the "Iowa idea." That is a sentiment in which I have some pride. I only pause to remark that I did not know that it had ever penetrated the recesses of this Chamber.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. CUMMINS. With pleasure.

Mr. ELKINS. I believe the Senator read a letter from the president of the W. R. Jones Glass Company, at Morgantown, W. Va. I have some knowledge of that city and of the company of which Mr. W. R. Jones is president. Mr. Jones is one of my honored constituents, but he did not come here in person and give his testimony, if the Senator will allow me to

inform him, but he wrote in reply to a letter directed to him by the Ways and Means Committee of the House. Mr. Jones says in his letter:

Mr. CUMMINS. Did he tell the truth?

Mr. ELKINS. That is the question; but let me get through.

Mr. CUMMINS. As he was an honored constituent, I assume that the Senator will be willing to affirm his veracity right on the spot.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. Jones wrote a letter to the House committee, in which he said, among other things:

As to the actual cost of labor in Europe, we are unable to give you the exact figures. We can only give it to you as we understand and learn it from workmen that have worked in Belgium and other countries and are now working for us.

That is hearsay. He admits he does not know anything of his own knowledge about wages in Europe or labor or price of glass there.

I quote again from his letter, which the Senator from Iowa read:

A former manufacturer, who carefully investigated the costs some years ago in Europe, informed me—

And so forth.

You see, Mr. President, hearsay again. He does not know anything of his own knowledge.

Further on in this letter he says:

We learn from intelligent Belgian workmen now employed by us the labor cost in their country, and we figure that the labor cost of the average size 50-foot box of window glass, 24 by 30, in Belgium would be about 44 cents.

Again I quote:

As to freight rates, we are informed that window glass is used largely as ballast in ships—

And so forth.

Now, Mr. President, I have read extracts from his letter, and every bit of his information is hearsay and comes from others. I happen to know something of the glass industry of Morgantown, W. Va., and I have talked with Mr. Keener, the president of the Morilla Glass Company, and he tells me of the eight glass manufacturers in Morgantown Mr. W. R. Jones is the only free trader in the business. All the rest of the manufacturers of glass want the duty as that reported in the bill before the Senate. Mr. Jones is the only exception. Mr. Keener told me when I was speaking to him about this remarkable letter, and how it was being used in the Senate to reduce the duty, that Mr. Jones was not only a free trader, but he was about the most virile, versatile, and vigorous Democrat in that city, and that he accounted for his statements by saying that Mr. Jones was probably following out his free-trade Democratic principles, but that every other glass manufacturer in Morgantown was favorable to the duty as reported in this bill.

Now, what I say comes from one of the most respectable and one of the best business men in Morgantown. I think it does not lessen the value of the statements of Mr. Jones that he is a Democrat, further than that there is a leaning toward free trade among Democrats.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not noticed it.

Mr. ELKINS. I can not understand it; I am glad I do not see so much of it as I used to see on the other side of the Chamber; but it does exist, and I can only account for his testimony, which is all hearsay, in that way.

Mr. President, with the Senator's permission—and he has been very kind and indulgent to me—I believe this is the only letter in the House hearings which holds to the view that this duty ought to be reduced. Speaking for my constituents in Morgantown interested in manufacturing glass, every one of them is against the statements or the hearsay opinion of Mr. Jones and favorable to the duty in the bill. We have there, as I said, eight glass factories.

There is one other point. Glass can be made in that city and contiguous country cheaper than in many other localities, because of natural gas and the sand being right at hand.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am glad to yield now to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. I should like to have credit given where it belongs. The Senator from Vermont spoke of the Iowa idea. It was originally a Minnesota idea and was transported to Iowa and has borne good fruit.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to acknowledge the paternity of the Iowa idea. It did come from the North, and like all things that come from the North, it came full of vigor and virility.

But answering the Senator from West Virginia, I thought it very strange that a manufacturer from West Virginia would admit that the duty on anything he was making was too high. I marveled at his unselfishness. I do not know whether he is a Democrat or a Republican. I do not know whether he is a truthful man or an untruthful man; but the fact that he was

making an admission against his own interest seemed to me to give his statement unusual weight and credit.

I think it is universally true that a manufacturer of any article would like to have a high duty on it. If I were making glass and consulting only my own interest, I would ask Congress, if I had any hope of obtaining that relief, to prevent absolutely the importation of any glass of any kind, so that the home market might be at my command. I do not wonder at that.

Mr. ELKINS. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not wonder that the lead producers of Idaho would like to see all lead excluded from the United States. I would be in that position if I were a producer of lead.

Mr. ELKINS. But this constituent of mine is a better Democrat than the Senator from Iowa. He sticks to his principles with a lofty courage, though against his interests. He is unselfish, looking to the good of the public and not to his own personal interest. The glass manufacturers of Morgantown want a high duty and protection on window glass, and I hope they will get it in this bill.

Mr. CUMMINS. Let us see if he is a better Democrat than is the "Senator from Iowa." I have often before heard that insinuation, and it has ceased to dismay or deter me. This particular Democrat seems to have fallen so far under the influence of the Senator from West Virginia as to want a high protective duty upon his commodity, and I suggest that if he be a free trader he has a very peculiar way of expressing his views when he asks for a cent a pound upon common, ordinary window glass; and I am willing to allow the industry a little more. When I see sellers everywhere disposing of their commodities at the prices I have named, and assuming that those prices bear any fair relation to the cost of the articles, then, Senators, there is absolutely no justification for imposing a duty that is higher than the Dingley law, and that is reiterated in the report of the committee. When the selling price of a commodity, taking all the sizes, is substantially the same as the duties upon the commodities, you ought to pause a little while, you ought to reflect a little while before you continue that, as it seems to me, abnormal condition, and you ought to do something to protect those people who may hereafter be called upon to buy glass against the effects of a combination which has been made in a hundred other fields of industry, which has been attempted in this field, and which may be successfully resorted to at any moment in the months to come.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the Senator allow me, for just one moment?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will.

Mr. SCOTT. I have been talking with a gentleman on the floor who is a stockholder in a window-glass factory in Morgantown. He says for five or six years none of them had any dividends out of their money invested. These are right in the heart of this almost free gas country, with sand at their door. It shows that Mr. Jones must be mistaken in what he can manufacture glass for.

I desire to say to the Senator, as to the crystal glass of which I spoke this morning, that 59 per cent of the glass factories in that line have failed within the last nine years and have gone out of business.

Mr. CUMMINS. I want the Senator from West Virginia to remember that I offered no amendment to the paragraph in which he was interested.

Mr. SCOTT. I am not speaking of that.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not believe the duties upon those articles are higher than they ought to be. If you have any idea that I am passing through this bill to offer amendments to every schedule and item in it, I want you to disabuse your minds of it immediately. I am only offering amendments to those paragraphs and to those commodities and articles upon which I believe there ought to be a reduction.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I should like to ask the Senator whether he believes the price of window glass is too high?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not. I have answered that question five times.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I did not hear the Senator before.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to answer it again.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am very sorry I did not hear the Senator. I should like to ask again whether he thinks there is fair, legitimate competition in its manufacture?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then what would be the object in reducing this duty?

Mr. CUMMINS. To guard the American people against that time at which there will be a combination in this industry.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does not the Senator believe that to reduce the duty would stimulate importations?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not; if you reduce it to the point suggested in my amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator believe that by reducing the duty we would add to the revenue?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Then, Mr. President, I can not see the object to be accomplished.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have attempted to explain it. The Senator from Michigan seems to be deluded with the idea that it does not make any difference what the duty on an article is. If we have on it now a duty of 1½ cents a pound, why not put on a duty of \$5 a pound? Answer me that question—why not?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Let me ask the Senator whether, in the case of window glass, the duty is added to the cost?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is not at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the consumer pay the tax?

Mr. CUMMINS. He pays no tax at the present time, but either the Senator must be very dull of comprehension or I must be unfortunate—

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I have the reputation of being dull.

Mr. CUMMINS. You did not allow me to finish—or I must be very unfortunate in expressing myself. It would not make any difference at the present time if the duty were \$10 an ounce upon window glass; but I am sure the Senator from Michigan would not support a proposition to make it \$10 an ounce. Why not?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No, Mr. President; but the statement made by the Senator from Iowa illustrates the efficacy of protection better than any argument I have heard made upon this floor in the last few days. Every single contention of the protectionist is demonstrated in your answer—

Mr. CUMMINS. I am attempting to speak of it from the protectionist standpoint.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan (continuing). Namely, that the window-glass tariff will stimulate production; that it will not add to the price; that it will maintain the American wage; and that the consumer gets the commodity at a reasonable price. That is our argument.

Mr. CUMMINS. On the contrary, in this particular case while it has stimulated production, it has not added to the wages, and it does not at the present time; the business does not at the present time return a fair reward upon the capital invested.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the Senator from Iowa claim that the wages of the glass workers of America are not greater than the wages paid to similar employees in Europe?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does not the Senator know that the wages paid the American glass maker are very much in excess of the European wage for similar workmen?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The glass tariff has brought about such healthful competition, has given to the consumer this article at a fair price, has given the American wage-earner a fair wage, and such are the very objects for which this bill is being framed.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Michigan insists all the while upon assuming that we are trying to overthrow protection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. You are attempting all the while to put me and every other man here who believes in any reduction of duties at all in the attitude of opposition to the system of protection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am just as ardent a believer in and as faithful to the principle of protection as is the Senator from Michigan. The only difference between him and me is that I believe there is a limit. I believe there is a point beyond which we should not go.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I believe that that point is the difference between the cost of producing the article here and of producing it elsewhere.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Iowa says the difference between us is that I am ultraradical in my position and he is willing to be convinced. I desire to say to the Senator from Iowa—and I say it in the kindest spirit, and I say it as the result of my observations during this debate—that the difference between the Senator from Iowa as a protectionist and myself is this: The Senator from Iowa feels that he is bound to redeem his promises to lower the tariff and I do not feel bound by the same token. That is the difference. I am quite content with the tariff that has brought such prosperity to the American people.

I voted for the Dingley law and I have never made an apology for it anywhere and I never will. It is not perfect, but the fruits are so bountiful that even the Senator from Iowa has picked them with liberality, and I refuse to admit that our party principle should be sacrificed for the purpose of preventing a possible monopoly of this product in the years to come.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am very glad I have given the Senator from Michigan an opportunity to recite the differences between himself and myself. I am not conscious, however, of having given him any cause to become quite so earnest in his denunciation of my position. It is true that I have believed that there are some duties in this schedule which ought to be reduced which are too high. He says there are no duties in this schedule that ought to be reduced.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No, Mr. President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. He did not say that. Will the Senator from Iowa permit me for a moment?

Mr. CUMMINS. My hearing is fairly accurate, and I must be permitted to give my understanding at least of what he said.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly; but will the Senator permit me for one moment?

Mr. CUMMINS. I will, with pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I thought I saw, when the Senator from Iowa made the statement which called the Senator from Michigan to his feet, that possibly the Senator had misrepresented the Senator from Michigan a little in this respect, that he said the difference was that he wanted to reduce some of the duties, and the Senator from Michigan had no limit to them. I do not understand that to be the position of the Senator from Michigan. Neither do I understand it to be the position of the Senator from Michigan that he does not want to reduce any duties. As a matter of fact, I think he does want to make reductions wherever he thinks they are justified by his principles of protection, which we all entertain. I think perhaps the Senator from Iowa misapprehended the Senator from Michigan. I do not understand him to be a protectionist, as the Senator said, without limit.

Mr. CUMMINS. I understood the Senator from Michigan to say first that the result of protection was the creation of competition in our own country that would always reduce the price of a commodity to a fair point. And that involves—mark you, now—the inference or the conclusion that it makes no difference how high that protection or that duty may be placed, because if competition reduces it to the American point then we ought all to be satisfied; and therefore I drew the conclusion that I stated and which I still believe to be correct.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. One thing further. The Senator from Michigan stated that he voted for the Dingley Act; that he was entirely satisfied with the Dingley duties; that he had never had occasion to apologize for or to criticize the Dingley duties; and from that statement I drew the inference, which, I think, was fair, that he did not believe now that any of the duties should be reduced.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Oh, no, Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. What duties do you think ought to be reduced?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Iowa would not put me in a false light.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not desire to put you in a false light.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The fact is that the Dingley law was the result of compromise. It was the result of great deliberation, with a common object in view, a little giving here and giving there, just as the new law, if it ever passes, will be the result of a compromise of conflicting views. But the principle back of the Dingley law is the principle for which I stand.

Mr. CUMMINS. Who has denied that?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. And I have no compromise to make with that principle.

Mr. CUMMINS. Who has denied that upon this side of the Chamber?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Senator from Iowa wants to reduce the tariff on window glass, not because the exactions are too great under the present tariff, not because there is no competition in it, not because wages are not what they ought to be, not because the price of glass is too high, but to meet a possible combination some time in the glass business. He wants to throw the markets of Europe and the market of our own country a little closer together. I do not want to do it. I want to keep them apart.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly; but I want Senators to bear witness that I am not taking up any considerable part of the time in this debate.

Mr. ROOT. I should like to ask a question, which perhaps the Senator from Iowa can answer, or possibly some other Senator more familiar with the manufacture of glass. I assure the Senator that I ask the question not for controversial purposes, but because I am very much interested in the subject, and I should like to get some information if I can.

I observe in the statistics of importation that there was an extraordinary drop in the importations of the article classified as common window glass in the year 1905, in all sizes. Of the first order—that is, not exceeding 10 by 15 inches square—the importations in 1904 were 20,382,739.72 pounds; in 1905 they dropped to 8,359,984.50 pounds. In the second class, not exceeding 16 by 24 inches, the importations in 1904 were 18,947,771.50 pounds; in 1905 they dropped to 5,914,057. In the next class, not exceeding 24 by 30 inches, the importations in 1904 were 7,131,937 pounds, and in 1905 they dropped to 2,162,412 pounds. In the highest class, not exceeding 24 by 36 inches, the importations in 1904 were 2,047,593 pounds, and they dropped in 1905 to 658,425 pounds.

From one year to another there was through all these different classes of window glass a reduction workings of the present tariff as it affects importations.

There has been some recovery, a full recovery in the lowest class—that is, not exceeding 10 by 15—so that we are now importing about the same as we did prior to 1905. But in the other classes there has not been much recovery. We have never gone back to more than about half of the importations that there were in 1904 and preceding years.

I should like very much to know whether that can be ascribed to some specific cause. It may possibly throw light upon the workings of the present tariff as it affects importations.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not investigated that particular phase of the subject to which the Senator from New York refers, but I think I can give him a very satisfactory answer.

In the years in which importations were made the American window-glass manufacturers, as I have been advised, were holding their prices very high. The reduction, as I remember it, in window glass, the marked reduction, has occurred within the last three or four years. Possibly there are some Senators here who remember the effort made about the year 1901 (it may have been 1900 or 1899) by the window-glass manufacturers to form a combination. It was partially successful, and it did maintain prices, as I remember it, for a time, but those prices within the last few years have been, as I said to the Senator from Michigan, subject to the fullest and the freest competition, and with the reduction in the price of window glass naturally the importations have decreased, because the foreign maker could not compete with the home maker in common window glass, if the duty as it now exists were cut in two. If you will divide the duty half and half, which I do not want to do, and will add it to the foreign cost of this character of glass, the result, without adding the freight, will still be greater than the American cost of the glass in any market of the country.

I confess, Mr. President, to being greatly influenced by the tendency of modern trade. If I believed that we were free from the danger I have attempted to describe, of such strangling of the competitive force in this trade as would eliminate it as a factor in price, I would not care whether the duty was 1½ cents a pound or 5½ cents a pound. It is our duty to protect those who are to deal with this commodity in future years, and it is the command of our party, not in its last platform, but in every platform it ever made, to put such rates only upon competitive articles as will give our manufacturers a fair chance and a little better than a fair chance in our own markets. When we pass beyond that point we not only overthrow the natural lines of economics, but we disturb and repudiate the principles of our own party and our own platform. That is the way I look at it.

If any one of you, I care not who he is, will show me or show the Senate that the duty I have proposed upon common window glass does not more than compensate for the difference between the cost abroad and at home, then you will have convinced me that I ought not to press the amendment; but you can not convince me by simply suggesting that the fear of a combination or the fear of some arrangement or concentration that will stifle competition is a baseless one. I know it is not an imaginary one. I have seen it exist in many a field of American industry. I know that it exists in many such fields now, and it is my duty, at least I so esteem it, to attempt to put on all these products that rate and that rate only which is necessary to fully and adequately protect our own interests.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. President, before the Senator from Iowa takes his seat, I simply wish to observe—

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I yield the floor entirely to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not in the habit of holding it very long, and I shall not hold it now, except to make one observation. I think the very point the Senator seeks to obtain is one that is most calculated to drive out competition among the glass makers of America. If he reduces the tariff, he will frighten the independent investor and operators, and he will drive them into a combination to meet conditions in Europe that are most unfavorable. Therefore, I would keep the tariff where it is for the purpose of keeping competition where it is, and the Senator from Iowa admits that competition is very fair and very helpful.

Mr. CUMMINS. I desire now to ask the Senator from Michigan a question, if he will permit me.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. Has such a duty prevented combinations in other fields?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No; I think it has not; neither has free trade. But the fact that it has prevented monopoly in this field is the thing we are dealing with now, and the thing we ought to deal with in the light of the information we have on this particular subject. When we reach some other schedule the Senator from Iowa may be able to point out a way to meet it.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Michigan believe that this specific duty has brought about the competition which now exists, and would not a duty of one-eighth of a cent higher or an eighth of a cent lower have done it?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I believe it is this present duty which has created the competition and stimulated the industry.

Mr. ROOT. Mr. President, before the adjournment, I should like to call the attention of those who support the duty on window glass as it stands in the pending bill to a statement made by Mr. Clause, who was a representative before the Ways and Means Committee of the manufacturers of window glass. Mr. Clause testified before that committee, on page 1656 of the Hearings in these words:

So far as glazing glass is concerned, I would say that practically there is no glazing glass imported. It is also true that as far as the glazing quality is concerned, the manufacturers are not availing themselves of the present duty.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that those statements, which accord with the statement that has been made here to-day, do call upon gentlemen who wish to retain the rate of duty in the pending bill for some explanation if they wish to have the Senate support that rate. I call attention to it before the adjournment in the hope that the subject will be completely elucidated when we take up this paragraph to-morrow.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think there will be no trouble in explaining that situation to the satisfaction of the Senator from New York when the matter is before the Senate again.

As to the matter to which he alluded in his remarks earlier in the day, I think that the falling off of importations in 1905 was owing to the invention about that time of glass-blowing machines, which were expected to take the place of the old processes and which have taken the place of the old processes of blowing common window glass, and I do not know but in a great many other directions. There was an absolute demoralization of the market both here and abroad for some considerable time owing to the use of the new glass-blowing machines.

I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 12, 1909, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, May 12, 1909.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, of the city of Washington.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. President, there is evidently not a quorum present. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Michigan suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

| | | | |
|-----------|--------------|------------|------------------|
| Aldrich | Burnham | Cullom | Gallinger |
| Bacon | Burrows | Cummins | Gamble |
| Beveridge | Burton | Curtis | Hale |
| Borah | Chamberlain | Daniel | Heyburn |
| Bradley | Clapp | Dick | Hughes |
| Briggs | Clark, Wyo. | Dillingham | Johnson, N. Dak. |
| Bristow | Clarke, Ark. | Dixon | Johnston, Ala. |
| Brown | Clay | Dolliver | Jones |
| Bulkeley | Crane | Fletcher | Kean |
| Burkett | Culberson | Frye | Lodge |

| | | | |
|----------|------------|--------------|------------|
| McCumber | Page | Root | Stone |
| McLaurin | Paynter | Scott | Sutherland |
| Martin | Penrose | Simmons | Warner |
| Nelson | Perkins | Smith, Mich. | Warren |
| Oliver | Rayner | Smith, S. C. | Wetmore |
| Overman | Richardson | Smoot | |

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. My colleague [Mr. BOURNE] is absent on account of illness in his family.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Sixty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum of the Senate is present. Petitions and memorials are in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PAGE presented the petition of T. J. Deavitt, of Montpelier, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to abolish the rule of the Pension Bureau requiring the execution of pension vouchers, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM presented memorials of sundry citizens of Rock Falls and Sterling, in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against an increase of the duty on the necessities of life, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have received sundry letters from citizens of New Hampshire asking for a reduction of the duty on wheat to 10 cents a bushel. I present two letters, one from W. L. Chase, of Raymond, N. H., and the other from H. A. Yeaton & Son, of Portsmouth, N. H., making this request. I move that the letters lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions of sundry citizens of Philadelphia, Frankford, and Tacony, all in the State of Pennsylvania, praying for a reduction of the duty on raw and refined sugars, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waterville, Me., and a petition of sundry citizens of Gardiner, Me., praying for a readjustment of the wool schedule to remedy the inequalities detrimental to the carded woolen industry, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Santa Clara County, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the immigration of all Asiatics into the United States except merchants, students, and travelers, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. BROWN presented sundry affidavits to accompany the bill (S. 564) granting a pension to Ida M. Smith, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 2323) granting an increase of pension to Abram N. Randolph (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2324) granting an increase of pension to George S. Rust (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WARREN:

A bill (S. 2325) to increase the efficiency of the United States Military Academy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 2326) for the relief of Julius A. Kaiser; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (S. 2327) to correct the military record of James Hagerty; and

A bill (S. 2328) to grant an honorable discharge to Alfred L. Dutton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 2329) granting an increase of pension to Israel P. Long;

A bill (S. 2330) granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Snyder;

A bill (S. 2331) granting an increase of pension to Hugh McDonald;

A bill (S. 2332) granting a pension to Annie A. Convery;

A bill (S. 2333) granting an increase of pension to John McGlone;

A bill (S. 2334) granting a pension to Theo. S. Fenn; and

A bill (S. 2335) granting an increase of pension to William H. McMailin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WETMORE:

A bill (S. 2336) for the enlargement of the Capitol grounds.

Mr. WETMORE. To accompany the bill, I submit a diagram showing the proposed plan. I move that it be printed facing the last page of the bill, and that it be referred with the bill to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was agreed to.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 2337) granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Crowell (with the accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.